

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

Pacific Theo Sem #Jan 11

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET
FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

APRIL, 1910.

Emanuel Swedenborg as a Cerebral Anatomist and Physiological
Psychologist. ALFRED H. STROH 161

Swedenborg in English Literature. IV. Walter H. Pater. EMILY
ROBBINS SUGDEN 177

The Inner Life. JOHN T. PRINCE 187

What the Conscience is. GEORGE HENRY DOLE 202

The Function of Revelation and Reason in the Church. JOHN
WHITEHEAD 208

A Study in Liturgics. FRANK SEWALL 222

The Duty of the New Church to Social Reform. T. MOWER
MARTIN 236

The True Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in its Internal Aspect.
JOHN FAULKNER POTTS 245

Professor James' Radical Empiricism. LEWIS F. HITE 258

Editorial Department: 275

The Bible and the Higher Criticism; Christianity and Modern Thought; Phil-
anthropies of Millionaires.

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies: 290

The Lord's Prayer (A Suggestion); The Prodigal Son (Luke xv, 11-32); *His-
torica, Vera Historica, Historica Facta.*

Current Literature: 302

The New-Church Quarterly, London, Vol. I, No. 1; Eucken's *The Problem of
Human Life*; Clarke's *The Christian Doctrine of God*; Hartford Theological Sem-
inary symposium on Recent Christian Progress; Gordon's *Religion and Miracle*;
Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, and *The Approach to the Social
Question*; Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*; Swedenborg's *Arcana Coelestia*, Vol.
XI, and *Conjugal Love*, Library Edition.

BOSTON:

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION,

16 ARLINGTON STREET.

50 CENTS A COPY.

(ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas.)

\$2.00 A YEAR

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is the lineal descendant of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, which was established as a monthly periodical in 1827. In 1893 it was believed that a quarterly review of the progress of the church and the world, allowing for longer articles and a more comprehensive treatment of subjects, would be of greater service. The form was therefore changed and a characteristic title adopted. The field to be covered has been the same for this long period now approaching a century, but greatly changed and ever changing more swiftly. The light in which it is viewed is from the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, unfolding as they do the spiritual meaning of the Holy Scriptures and fulfilling the prophecy of the Lord's second coming to save mankind.

The REVIEW is seeking to set forth these principles, which are represented in the closing chapters of the Word by the symbolic New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven to a new earth (REV. xxi, 1, 2). It is endeavoring to show their application not only to the organized New Church but also to the world in this period of transition and upheaval that is ushering in a "new era" of thought and life. In this effort it has been supported by able writers both in this country and abroad; and with such success as to call forth warm commendations. A prominent minister, experienced as an editor of another periodical of our faith, has just written, "I wish you every success in the publication of the REVIEW, which is a splendid representative of the church." A layman in the great city of the West, renewing his subscription for 1910, adds:—

"I desire to record my profound satisfaction with the REVIEW. I read every issue from cover to cover. . . . I feel like blessing the Lord that He has raised up a corps of writers who can so learnedly and lucidly treat of the deeper things belonging to His New Church."

The Rev. William H. Mayhew, finding his strength unequal to the additional duties, has felt obliged to resign the office of managing editor, which he has filled so well for two years; and the Board, as now organized, consists of the Rev. H. Clinton Hay as managing editor, and of the Rev. Messrs. William H. Mayhew and Lewis F. Hite; with the Rev. James Reed in an advisory capacity.

Entering upon its seventeenth year the REVIEW asks for the continued and increased support of those whom it serves.

\$2.00 A YEAR.

SINGLE NUMBERS 50 CENTS.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union, 16 Arlington Street, Boston.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XVII.]

APRIL, 1910.

[No. 2.

EMANUEL SWEDENBORG AS A CEREBRAL ANATOMIST AND PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGIST.*

EMANUEL SWEDENBORG, who was born at Stockholm, on the twenty-ninth of January, 1688, and died at London on the twenty-ninth of March, 1772, is well known in various parts of the world as a "spirit-seer" and as the author of a series of most remarkable theological works; but that he also was a great investigator in various departments of natural science and psychology, is first in our times beginning to be generally acknowledged. Many treatises concerning Swedenborg's life and activities have seen the light since his death, but most of them refer exclusively to his later activity, from 1743 to 1772, although he came forward also during the years 1700 to 1745 as the author of a series of works treating of natural science, as well as of other contributions of poetical and historical content. During thirty-five years, from 1710 to 1745, Swedenborg devotes himself to a many-sided study of nature and man. He begins with physics, mathematics, and astronomy; makes discoveries in geology; and so proceeds with investigations concerning chemical, physical, and cosmological subjects, closing this earlier

* The contents of this paper were delivered as a lecture and then discussed at a meeting of the Psychological Society at Upsala University, Sweden, on the 13th of October, 1908. After appearing in the periodical *Psyke*, published at Upsala, the paper was published in separate form, and is now translated from the Swedish by the author and furnished with amplifying explanatory footnotes.

period of activity with a series of philosophical, anatomical, physiological and psychological investigations. In his studies of human nature, he devotes many years to the investigation of the brain and nervous system, and constructs a theory which in many respects agrees with the views of the present time.

Swedenborg's father, Jesper Swedberg, well known in the history of the Swedish Church as a hymnwriter and bishop had little inclination for scientific studies or philosophy. During a disputation at the University of Lund he took part in the discussion, making a witty opposition to metaphysical difficulties and hypotheses. Later on at Upsala, as professor of theology, dean of the Cathedral, and rector of the University, he continued in the same direction. His sons were at an early age entered in the Vestmanland-Dala Nation,* Emanuel on the fifteenth of June, 1699, on which occasion he was described in the "Album Studiosorum" as being of the best genius (*optimæ indolis*). Ten years later, on the first of June, 1709, Swedenborg defended a disputation concerning some sentences of Publius Syrus Mimus and Seneca, under the presidency of Master Fabianus Törner, professor of theoretical philosophy. Swedenborg's earliest letters discover a strong interest for studies in natural science and philosophy, which can only be explained by an earlier development in that direction at Upsala. Since Jesper Swedberg was a neighbor of Olof Rudbeck, senior, whose "*Atlantica*" is frequently referred to in Swedenborg's earliest writings, it is very likely that Swedenborg, while still a young student, met or received impressions from the great investigator. It is certain that the severe Cartesian controversy at the Uni-

* When the University constitution of 1655 was adopted, the formation of "nations," or clubs of students from the various provinces of the country, was strictly forbidden; but they were formed nevertheless some years later. The first inspector of the Vestmanland-Dala Nation was the famous anatomist and author of "*Atlantica*," Olof Rudbeck, senior, professor in the Faculty of Medicine, and a defender of the revolutionary Cartesian philosophy. He was succeeded in the inspectorship by Professor Jesper Swedberg. Although there had at first been so much opposition to the formation of the "nations," membership in them gradually became obligatory as the first step in becoming a student at the University, a custom which prevails to this day.

versity during the latter half of the seventeenth century, in which controversy Rudbeck took a lively part, had to such a degree shaken dogmatic authority, that a freer investigation had begun during Swedenborg's stay at Upsala. As early as 1710 a movement began which afterwards resulted in the Royal Scientific Society. The real founder was Swedenborg's brother-in-law, Eric Benzelius, junior, with whom Swedenborg lodged after his father's removal to Scara in 1703; and the remaining founders were professors in the faculties of Medicine and Philosophy. These faculties had also during the Cartesian controversy defended scientific investigation and philosophical freedom. From Swedenborg's letters it may also be seen that it was the versatile Benzelius who had turned his thoughts in the direction of natural philosophy; and among the founders of the Society, several of whom are mentioned by Swedenborg in his early letters, there were a number of Cartesians. In Swedenborg's letters and also in all his printed works in which cosmological questions are discussed, there are found traces of influence from the Cartesian philosophy which had aroused so severe a controversy at the University. This becomes clear by comparing Descartes' "*Principia Philosophiæ*" with Swedenborg's "*Principia Rerum Naturalium*," especially as concerns the vortices. It is very likely that Descartes' conception of the anatomy and physiology of the brain and nervous system, especially with respect to the theory of "animal spirits," and the sensory and motor functions of the nerves also, had a powerful influence upon Swedenborg's thoughts. Descartes had constructed an hypothesis, teaching that the motions of the body are executed by a flux of the "animal spirits" from the ventricles of the brain through the nerves to the muscles, and that the sense organs likewise send their messages from the peripheries of the body through the nerves to the brain, where the pineal gland governs. These fundamental ideas not only recur in Swedenborg's works, where they are further developed, but the essential portions of both Descartes' and Swedenborg's theories agree with the physiological conceptions of the present time.

As early as 1716-1718, Swedenborg began to develop his physiological theories in his *Daedalus Hyperboreus*, Sweden's first periodical devoted to natural science. In the latter part of a work "On the Infinite," 1734, where the "mechanism of the soul and body" is treated of, we first find Swedenborg's theory that the psychical phenomena have their seat in the grey substance and especially in the cortex of the cerebrum, — a modern idea of which Prof. Gustaf Retzius writes that it may be traced like a red thread through all of Swedenborg's writings concerning the nervous system, and that it must be emphasized that both before and long after Swedenborg's time anatomists of the highest rank thought that Psyche's abode was in other parts of the brain, in the white substance, in the walls of the ventricles, or in their fluids.

Swedenborg's contributions to the fields of anatomy and physiology were mentioned long ago by Haller in his "*Bibliotheca Anatomica*," although the short reviews of Swedenborg's works which are found in Haller's work show that he did not fully understand the significance of Swedenborg's investigations. We are forced to the conclusion that Swedenborg's contemporaries did not understand the best things he produced in the field of the natural sciences; and that his great significance as a natural scientist was first beginning to be seen some decades after his death. From 1830 to 1850 there were published in Germany and England editions of Swedenborg's anatomical and physiological works, edited partly by the German, Dr. J. F. Immanuel Tafel, Librarian at Tübingen, and partly by the Englishman, Dr. James John Garth Wilkinson. The German-American Dr. Rudolf L. Tafel, Im. Tafel's nephew, continued the work of his predecessors, and in 1882 and 1887 printed at London the first two volumes of a work entitled, "The Brain," in which he combines and discusses Swedenborg's writings concerning the brain. Two additional volumes lie ready in manuscript; but the learned investigator of Swedenborgiana was unable to finish the printing of his wonderful scientific and critical works before death carried him off. His

predecessor, Dr. Wilkinson, had also made valuable investigations pointing in the same direction; but it was really Tafel, who, on the basis of later discoveries concerning the brain and nervous system, was in a position to write his masterpiece "The Brain," in which he emphasizes Swedenborg's astonishing discoveries. In 1901, at the meeting of German naturalists and physicians at Hamburg, Dr. Max Neuburger, Docent of the History of Medicine at the University of Vienna, now professor there of the same subject, delivered an enthusiastic address concerning Swedenborg's discoveries in brain physiology, which address was reproduced in a free Swedish translation by Professor C. G. Santesson in *Hygiea*, 1902. On the basis of Tafel's and Neuburger's presentation, and also on the basis of later investigations—for the Swedenborg Committee of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences had been appointed in December, 1902, on the motion of Prof. Gustaf Retzius—he presented in 1903, in an address as President of the International Congress of Anatomists at Heidelberg, a review of Swedenborg's significance as an anatomist and physiologist of the brain and nervous system, which is the most complete presentation ever published. Professor Retzius has also referred to the same subject in an address on the finer structure of the nervous system, delivered before the Royal Society of London, on the fourteenth of May, 1908. An address on Swedenborg's anatomical works, delivered by Prof. O. M. Ramström at the last graduation of Doctors of Medicine at Upsala, but not yet accessible in print, must be considered to be especially valuable on account of its discussion of pathological factors in Swedenborg's theory of brain localizations.

As concerns the Swedish literature, it is probable that the first expression concerning the significance of Swedenborg's anatomical works and theories is contained in a treatise by Anders Retzius on "The Origin and Development of Anatomy in the Scandinavian North," delivered on leaving the Presidency of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences on the ninth of April, 1845. In it Swedenborg's "Animal Kingdom" and "Economy

of the Animal Kingdom" are mentioned in the following words:—

In this period Emanuel Swedenborg also appeared as an author on anatomical and physiological subjects. He had previously distinguished himself as a mathematician, physicist, chemist, mineralogist and geologist. Besides possessing an immense learning in all the sciences, he desired by means of it to find the path to knowledge concerning the human soul and to penetrate still further into the highest regions of thought. With this end in view he worked out his "*Regnum Animale*" and "*Œconomia Regni Animalis*," London, 1740, quarto, which latter work has now been republished at London, translated into English by Wilkinson. Haller, indeed, makes favorable mention of the "*Œconomia Regni Animalis*" in his "*Bibliotheca Anatomica*"; but beyond this Swedenborg's physiological writings have remained unread and not been understood until the most recent times. His "*Regnum Animale*" has now again appeared like a marvel. One finds there ideas belonging to the most recent times, a scope, induction and tendency, which can only be compared with those of Aristotle. It may be supposed that one or two decades will still be required in order to rightly estimate the merits of this work. Having finished his physiological works, Swedenborg passed over to his investigations concerning the soul, and from these to those concerning the spiritual world and religion, which have gained so many adherents in various parts of the world.

If, now, we compare Swedenborg's expressions in a great many works treating of various anatomical, physiological and psychological questions, with modern brain anatomy and physiological psychology, we find, according to the professors, Rudolf L. Tafel, Max Neuburger, Gustaf Retzius and C. G. Santesson, that Swedenborg during the years 1734-1745 advanced the following discoveries and theories, which have first long afterwards, on account of later investigations, been generally received:—

1. *The seat of the psychical phenomena is in the grey substance, especially in the cortex of the cerebrum.* Swedenborg first gave expression to this thought in 1734, in the latter part of his work "Concerning the Infinite" ("*De Infinito*"), and it is emphasized again and again in his later works. Concerning this theory of Swedenborg's Professor Neuburger writes:—

This process of reasoning was quite simple, and was wholly based on anatomical grounds. Swedenborg, who in spite of his superiority, was yet but a child of his times, believed in the existence of "spirits of life" ("*spiritus animales*"), which by all the scientifically thinking anatomists and physiologists of that age were supposed to convey both the higher psychical functions and the perceptions and motions. Like Malpighi and his followers, Swedenborg believed that the cortical substance was the place where these "*spiritus animales*" were generated; and he believed this to be the case either because of its supposed glandular structure, or because of its very great wealth of minute blood vessels (Ruysch). Do not the finest arteries close in the cortex? Where else, if not there, could the "animal spirits" be generated from the blood by means of a most delicate process of elaboration? Moreover, if with Malpighi, Swammerdam, Winslow, and Boerhaave, we follow the threads of the medullary substance to their source, we find that they spring from the cortex. This, therefore, is that "medium" which lies exactly at the terminating points of the blood vessels and at the initiatory points of the nerves, and which, therefore, out of the blood of the former, manufactures "nervous fluid" for the latter. Where else is one to seek for the material substratum of the Psyche, if not in the cortex, this, the finest, most highly organized of all substances?

Now, though these premises were generally considered quite sound, still it did not occur to anyone but Swedenborg to carry them out to their logical conclusion. Though the mode of reasoning may perhaps seem somewhat primitive in these days, yet we may pertinently ask whether Sömmerring, for instance, an anatomical specialist, took higher ground when, at as late a date as 1796, he defended the view that the seat of the soul is to be found in the cerebro-spinal fluid? Regarded from the light or view point of his own times, Swedenborg discovered an important truth, even though he arrived at it by a peculiar method, a method, however, which was not an unusual one in that age. The conclusions of Haller, and many other eminent authors, that the soul resides in the medullary substance or in the *medulla oblongata* (on the ground that attacks of cramp have resulted from irritating those parts during experiments with animals) are hardly less naive than Swedenborg's hypothesis. As we progress the accessory aids become more and more subsidiary, the scaffolding falls away; the ultimate result alone is of permanent value.*

* Professor Neuburger's paper contains many striking passages like the one we have here quoted; and his results, as recorded in a number of shorter contributions, have been reported in Professor C. G. Santesson's article on Swedenborg in "Nordisk Tidskrift" for 1904. All of the contributions referred to are included in the Bibliography at the close of these "Testimonies." We have quoted from all of the writers who have in recent years published contributions

Professor Neuburger also quotes a passage of the "*Œconomia Regni Animalis*," in which the doctrine that the seat of the psychical powers is in the cortex, is very clearly stated:—

In hac unitate seu in hac substantia inesse debet superior illa potentia, quam quaerimus. Ergo facultas intelligendi, cogitandi, judicandi, volendique Animae non in aliqua ulteriori, quia ultima est cerebri, inquirenda est.

[That superior power which we seek must be in this unity or this substance. Therefore the mind's faculty of understanding, thinking, judging, and willing, must not be sought in anything beyond it [the cortex], because it is the ultimate of the brain, [*i.e.*, constitutes the end-stations of the brain system].]*

2. *The cortex of the brain contains motor as well as sensory centres, and various regions of the cortex govern various motor regions of the body.* Professors Neuburger and Retzius quote a number of passages from Swedenborg's works, published as well as unpublished, in which the theory of localizations is developed; and as these quotations are very striking, they will be reproduced here as found in the above-mentioned writers' addresses:—

Ut cerebrum ex suo cortice, ut a motus principiis, possit quas velit, fibras, nervos et musculos excitare.

[So that the brain from its cortex, as from the originating sources of motion, is able to excite whatever fibres, nerves, and muscles it wishes.]

Experientiæ est et temporis, ut investigetur qui gyrus et qui serpens tumulus in cerebro hunc aut illum musculus ut correspondentem suum in corpore respiciat.

[To investigate what fold and what convolution in the cerebrum is related to this or to that muscle as its correspondent in the body, is a matter requiring prolonged experimentation.]

concerning Swedenborg's investigations of the anatomy and physiology of the brain, because the analysis of Swedenborg's works has time and again, made rapid progress in the contributions referred to. It should, however, be observed, that some of the most striking comparisons of Swedenborg's results with those of modern workers are found as early as 1882, in the valuable introduction to Vol. I, of "*The Brain*," by Dr. R. L. Tafel.

*As the writer has not translated his Latin quotations, the English has been added in brackets. — EDITORS.

Ergo inquirendum venit, qui tori corticei his aut illis musculis in corpore correspondent; quod fieri non potest, nisi per experientiam in vivis animalibus, per punctiones, sectiones et compressiones plurium, perque inde in corporis musculis redundantes effectus.

[Therefore it has to be investigated, what swellings of the cortex correspond to these or to those muscles in the body; which cannot be done except by experiments on live animals,— by prickings, cuttings, and compressions of many kinds, and by the effects thence manifesting themselves in the muscles of the body.]

Professor Retzius says that the above expressions have been rightly described as being of an “astonishing” character; and in his address concerning the finer structure of the nervous system, delivered before the Royal Society of London on the 14th of May, 1908, after having pointed out how our physiological knowledge concerning the motor and sensory centres of the brain, after their existence had been experimentally proved by Fritsch and Hitzig, has been further developed by such investigators as Sir Victor Horsley, Schäfer, Beevor, Ferrier, Sherrington and others, he remarks that the history of this subject confirms the old saying that “there is nothing new under the sun,” for we cannot but be astonished that Swedenborg, in his work “*Œconomia Regni Animalis*,” already had a prophetic insight into modern cerebral physiology. Having made two quotations from Swedenborg’s works, Professor Retzius says:—

As we see, this is nothing short of a full programme in the experimental physiology of the brain, which this marvellous man here lays before us; and we are yet again amazed to read his clearly worded statement that the muscles of the lower extremities have their centre at the top of the cerebral cortex, the muscles of the abdomen and thorax in the central portion of the cerebrum, those of the head and face at the bottom, “nam videntur ordine inverso sibi correspondere.”*

* As the whole of the matter relating to Swedenborg in the address of Professor Retzius before the Royal Society in 1908 should be easily accessible to students of Swedenborg, it may here be quoted:—

“The scientific investigation of the histology and physiology of the central nervous system, above all of the brain, is surely one of the most difficult problems presented to human intelligence to solve. With good reason Emil Dubois Reymond’s famous ejaculation “*ignorabimus*” may be applicable here.

The passage from Swedenborg's manuscript, Codex 58, page 217, referred to above, is quoted by Professor Retzius in his Heidelberg address: —

Ita etiam dispositus videtur ordo, quod id efficiant corpora striata, quæ cerebrum determinat, et mens rationalis jubet, imo ita ut a supremis immediatus dependeant musculi et actiones, quæ in ultimis corporis sunt, seu

“E pur si muove.” How rapidly has our physiological knowledge of the localization of the *motor* and *sensory centres* in the brain, since Fritsch and Hitzig first showed their existence by experimental proof, gone forwards step by step, owing principally to the brilliant discoveries of the English investigators, Sir Victor Horsley, Schäfer, Beevor, Ferrier, Sherrington, and still others.

“It is indeed true that the proverb, ‘There is nothing quite new under the sun,’ is not without an illustration here too; for one cannot but be astounded to find that, as far back as the year 1741, the Swedish polyhistor and scientist, Emanuel Swedenborg, was able, in his famous work ‘*Economia Regni Animalis*,’ with his prophetic vision to set up as a goal for the science of physiology of the brain the following standard: ‘*Experientiæ est et temporis. ut investigetur qui gyrys et qui serpens tumulus in cerebro hunc aut illum musculum ut correspondentem suum in corpore respiciat,*’ and ‘*Ergo inquirendum venit, qui tori corticei his aut illis musculis in corpore correspondent: quod fieri non potest nisi per experientiam in vivis animalibus, per punctiones, sectiones et compressiones plurium, perque inde in corporis musculis redundantes effectus.*’ As we see, this is nothing short of a full programme in the experimental physiology of the brain which this marvelous man here lays before us; and we are yet again amazed to read his clearly worded statement that the muscles of the lower extremities have their centre at the top of the cerebral cortex, the muscles of the abdomen and thorax in the central portions of the cerebrum, those of the head and face at the bottom, ‘*nam videntur ordine inverso sibi correspondere.*’ It has been my purpose in quoting these theses of Swedenborg’s to point out that grand scientific discoveries, of which our own age is rightly proud, may have been not only vaguely guessed at, but actually set forth in clear and definite terms by one or another brilliant enquiring mind of an earlier age. The theses cited are drawn up with such precision by Swedenborg that they cannot possibly be based on divination only, but must rest upon a real grasp of natural phenomena as well as on actual experiments and dissecting work.

“A more thorough knowledge of the minute structure of the brain and the whole nervous system was essential, if the physiology of those organs was to advance. To that end the perfecting of the microscope was a *conditio sine qua non*. Earlier anatomists, *e.g.*, Leewenhoek and Malpighi, had paved the way, it is true, to our present results, but did not proceed far themselves. In accord with the last-named great Italian scientist (Malpighi), Emanuel Swedenborg, however, put forward a remarkable theory regarding the composition of the cerebral cortex, which he, in opposition to so many anatomists of that day, definitely declared to be the seat of the psychical phenomena.”

in plantis; a lobo medio musculi qui sunt abdominis et thoracis, et a lobo tertio, qui sunt faciei et capitis; nam videntur ordine inverso sibi correspondere.

[Thus also the order of arrangement is seen to be such that the *corpora striata* carry out what the brain determines and the rational mind commands, in such a manner, indeed, that the muscles and actions in the extremities of the body, or in the soles of the feet, depend immediately on the highest region of the brain, the muscles of the abdomen and the thorax on the middle lobe, and on the third lobe those of the face and the head; for they are seen to correspond each to each in an inverse order.]

With regard to the sensory centres, Swedenborg appears not to have expressed himself in such detail as concerning the motor centres, although he was aware that the so-called *corpora quadrigemina*, situated at the base of the brain, have a connection with the movements of the pupils of the eyes. As Professor Retzius emphasizes, Swedenborg follows the nerves from the peripheries of the body to the brain, where every "fibre" goes to its special "spherula" in the cerebral cortex. From Swedenborg's presentation it is clear that he on the one hand considered that both the motor and sensory nerve fibres have their end-stations in the cerebral cortex, although, on the other hand, as concerns the sensations themselves, he considered that they are not confined to special portions of the cortex, or to given centres. He says:—

Ergo nulla cerebri pars individua organo cuidam sensorio corporis correspondet, sed est substantia corticis in communi, quæ nullius non gradus modificationes secundum seriem, in quam disposita est, recipit, et ad judicem animam convenienter refert; quæ percipit, intelligit, sapit quamcunque mutationem ex cujuscunque generis, speciei, gradus tactu suo systemati ejusque nexibus. . . . Hæc confirmantur in apoplecticis, epilepticis, maniacis . . . catulis.

[Therefore no individual part of the brain corresponds to any particular sensory organ but it is the substance of the cortex as a whole which receives the modifications of every degree according to the series in which it [the substance] is arranged, and suitably refers [the modifications] to the mind as judge; and this perceives, understands, and knows every change of any kind, species, and degree by touch with its system and its connections. . . . This is confirmed in the case of apoplectics, epileptics, maniacs . . . puppies.]

It is no doubt most correct to suppose that Swedenborg's idea concerning the sensory end-stations in the cortex of the brain and of the sensations themselves, although not in appearance so well developed as his theory of the motor centres, agrees very well with our modern views. Prof. Rob. Tigerstedt, for example, says in his "*Lehrbuch der Physiologie des Menschen*," that "Bei den komplizierteren geistigen Leistungen wirken wohl alle Assoziations- und Sinneszentren zusammen, da sie untereinander durch zahllose Nervenfasern verbunden sind, und daraus resultiert die Einheitlichkeit der Grosshirnleistungen."

[All the association centres and sense centres together work well with the complicated mental functions, since they [the centres] are bound to each other by numberless nerve fibres; and from this the unity of the total brain functions results.]

With regard to the unconscious motions, Swedenborg says that they are governed by the grey substance of the cerebellum and central ganglia. His many expressions concerning the differences between the activity of the cerebrum and the cerebellum in the "soul's kingdom" ("*regnum animale*"), that is, the human body, are of a very interesting character.

3. *The motion of the brain is synchronous with the breathing of the lungs.* Concerning this theory of Swedenborg's we read in "*Nordisk Tidskrift*," 1904, in an article by Prof. C. G. Santesson:—

As concerns the pulse-like motions of the brain, Swedenborg held the correct view, that they are synchronous and depend upon the breathing. This had been stated by Galen and some of his followers, but had afterwards been denied; the pulsations were supposed by some to depend upon the blood-vessels, by others upon the active contraction of the *dura mater*. Some years after the publication of Swedenborg's "Economy" the anatomist Schlichting again (1750) described the correct relationship of the phenomena, — without, however, mentioning Swedenborg.

4. *There must be a communication between the two lateral ventricles of the cerebral hemispheres ("Foramen Monroi"), and the cerebro-spinal fluid flows through the fourth ventricle into the subarachnoidal space, and from the calamus scriptorius into the central canal of the spinal cord.* According to the statement of Professor Retzius, Swedenborg not only discovered before Cotugno the existence of the cerebro-spinal fluid, but also its

distribution and great significance. It is clear from Swedenborg's expressions concerning the *calamus scriptorius*, and its opening into the spinal cord, that he clearly understood that there was such a passage, although the anatomical or experimental proofs were still lacking. Besides the above mentioned discoveries, Professor Retzius says that Swedenborg had already thoroughly described the discharge of the cerebro-spinal fluid by means of the *fila olfactoria* into the mucous membrane of the nose, and is therefore a predecessor of G. Schwalbe and of Key and Retzius, and that Swedenborg had developed a doctrine of the production of a lymph in the cerebral cortex and of a lymphatic circulation through the whole body.

Without here going further into the subject of Swedenborg's theories of brain diseases, or his highly developed system of fibres, fluids and circulations in the brain, nervous system, and body, I desire only to call attention to the fact that in all his earlier writings he maintains the standpoint, that all psychical phenomena are explainable in a mechanical way; they are properties of different grades of most highly complicated substances in the brain and nervous system. This view also agrees very well with Swedenborg's earlier cosmology, where he supposes a single series of geometrical particles, beginning with the Infinite, which by means of mathematical points creates the first substantial particles, which are further compounded in the development of nature, forming several grades of substances and matters, which correspond to the different grades of the soul and body. In Swedenborg's last scientific works this doctrine of correspondences is developed; and he likewise begins to distinguish sharply between two degrees of existence, the psychical and the corporeal, or the spiritual and the natural. In his later theological writings we find again many of his results concerning the anatomy and functions of the brain, although the system which now meets us continually differentiates between two series of substances and phenomena, between the spiritual and natural degrees and forms; but this is too extensive a subject to permit of its here being treated in detail.

On taking a general view of Swedenborg's theories and discoveries in the departments of cerebral anatomy and physiological psychology, we cannot avoid the question, How was it possible for a non-specialist in anatomy really to come to such profound conclusions so early as the former half of the eighteenth century? He refers to experiments upon animals, and we know that he studied anatomy in Italy and Holland; but it is not known where and when he dissected and experimented, although he himself says that he had used the scalpel, but had laid it aside. In his Heidelberg address Professor Retzius thus expresses himself concerning Swedenborg's astonishing statements respecting the position of the motor centres in the cerebral cortex: —

Whether he arrived at this conception through his own physiological or pathological discoveries, cannot be definitely determined from the accounts in such of his voluminous printed or unprinted works as have hitherto been examined.

In the same address it is further stated as to Swedenborg's method and significance, that he

was not only a learned anatomist and a sharp-sighted observer, but also in many respects an unprejudiced, acute, and deep anatomical thinker.

He towers in the history of the study of the Brain as a unique, wonderful, phenomenal spirit, as an ideal seeker for truth, who advances step by step to ever higher problems.

Since the edition of Swedenborg's scientific works now under publication by the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences will contain some of his anatomical and physiological works, we may also expect a complete examination of their contents, which are without doubt of great interest for the history of the natural sciences and psychology.

ALFRED H. STROH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, COMPILED BY ALFRED H. STROH.

SWEDENBORG, Emanuel.

Oeconomia Regni Animalis, two volumes, Amsterdam, 1740-41.

Regnum Animale, three volumes, the Hague and London, 1744-45.

De Anima, edited by Dr. Jo. Fr. Immanuel Tafel, Tübingen, 1849.

The three above-mentioned works have also been translated into English, and published in several editions in England and America. There is, besides, a large work containing many of Swedenborg's statements concerning the brain, translated into English with a commentary by Dr. Rudolf L. Tafel, entitled "The Brain," two vols., London, 1882-87.

Among the discussions of Swedenborg's works concerning cerebral anatomy and psychology the following may be referred to:—

TAFEL, R. L., Two introductions to Swedenborg's work "The Brain," 1882-87.

SEWALL, Frank, Introduction to "The Soul," a translation of Swedenborg's *De Anima*, two editions, New York, 1887 and 1900.

NEUBURGER, Max, "Swedenborg's Beziehungen zur Gehirnphysiologie," in *Wiener medicin. Wochenschr.* No. 44, 1901. In a free Swedish translation by C. G. Santesson, in *Hygiea*, Stockholm, 1902, and in English in *New Church Life*, 1902.

Two short papers by Professor Neuburger, "Swedenborg's Stellung zur Lehre von der Vita Propria," and "Was lehrte Swedenborg über die Funktion der Vierhügel," appeared in *Janus*, 1903. The paper on the "Vita Propria" also appeared in an English translation in the *New-Church Magazine*, 1903.

RETZIUS, Gustaf, "Emanuel Swedenborg als Anatom und Physiolog auf dem Gebiete der Gehirnkunde," in *Verhandlungen der Anatomischen Gesellschaft*, Jena, 1903. In English in *New-Church Life*, 1903, and also reprinted in pamphlet form.

"The Principles of the Minute Structure of the Nervous System as revealed by Recent Investigations." Croonian Lecture in *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, B. Vol. 80, 1908.

SANTESSON, C. G., *Nagra Drag ur Emanuel Swedenborgs lif, särskildt om hans betydelse sasom anatomisk-fysiologisk forskare*, in "Nordisk Tidskrift," Stockholm, 1904. In English in *The New-Church Messenger*, 1904.

Further miscellaneous contributions and references of interest in connection with Swedenborg's anatomical, physiological, psychological and other writings, will be found in the following works: —

TAFEL, JO. FR. IM., *Sammlung von Urkunden betreffend das Leben und den Charakter Emanuel Swedenborg's*, Tübingen 1839-42. See especially a translation in German, pages 434-436, of a discussion in the "Intellectual Repository," 1842, page 170, concerning Swedenborg's reference to a connection between the lateral ventricles of the brain, *i. e.*, the "foramen Monroi," subsequently discovered by Monro.

RETZIUS, Anders, *Skrifter i skilda ämnen, jämte några bref af Anders Retzius*, collected and published by Gustaf Retzius, Stockholm, 1902. The statement of Anders Retzius, quoted above, occurs on page 96.

WILKINSON, James John Garth, has published introductions to the English translations of "*Oeconomia Regni Animalis*" and "*Regnum Animale*," and also a number of historical, biographical and critical works, issued by the Swedenborg Association and the Swedenborg Society of London from about 1840 to 1890.

TAFEL, R. L., has published, besides Swedenborg's "The Brain," London, 1882-1887, a series of facsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's manuscripts, ten volumes folio, Stockholm, 1869-70; and also a thorough work in three volumes, "Documents concerning the Life and Character of Emanuel Swedenborg," London, 1875-77.

ODHNER, Carl Theophilus, has published the first volume of a work containing numerous references to the whole literature by and concerning Swedenborg: *Annals of the New Church, with a chronological account of the life and character of Emanuel Swedenborg*. Volume I, 1688-1850, Bryn Athyn, Pennsylvania, 1904.

HYDE, James, has published a very comprehensive bibliographical and analytical work on Swedenborg's writings, containing many new references to Swedenborg's manuscripts and printed works in all editions, original as well as translated: *A Bibliography of the works of Emanuel Swedenborg, original and translated*, London, 1906.

STROH, Alfred H., *Grunddragen af Swedenborgs Lij*, Stockholm, 1908. See the fourth chapter on Swedenborg's anatomical, physiological and psychological works, 1734-45.

SWEDENBORG IN ENGLISH LITERATURE.

IV. WALTER H. PATER.

THERE are writers whose place in the history of literature is largely chronological; we know that they lived and wrote between certain dates, but though they may have written in accordance with that time, perhaps depicting its manners and customs with subtle skill, yet they were not so imbued with the peculiar characteristics of the age that they can be identified with it alone. Had they lived in an earlier period their work would have conformed to it, and they would have equally well caroled with the Elizabethans, swaggered through the Restoration, or fought the intellectual duel with the wits of Queen Anne's time. Walter Pater was not of these. We can easily imagine him writing at almost any time in the future, but with the past he is incongruous, for his genius was essentially an offspring of the new age which is distinguished for its recognition of

“—— a life within this life
We take so commonly.”

Probably no author of equal fame since the days of easy and brisk international communication has been personally less known to his readers than Pater. During his lifetime none of the little stories of family life or of personal preferences and aversions were widely enough circulated to produce the familiarity which endears some writers to their readers and adds to the popular if ephemeral renown of their writings. Even the reputation of being the prototype of Edward Langham in Mrs. Ward's celebrated novel “Robert Elsmere” failed to make his individuality distinct to the general public who read that much-discussed work. The nearest approach to a personal anecdote that became common knowledge, was one frequently and variously printed regarding his painstaking habit when writing, of

working over one sentence for an unusual length of time, the exact number of minutes or hours varying as they passed through the minds and pens of different reporters. Undoubtedly this more than twice-told tale deepened the impression already prevalent that he was in literature a mere stylist, and repelled many who otherwise would have been refreshed and stimulated by the rare and luminous atmosphere of his work.

Although his long residence first as student then as Fellow at Oxford necessitated his coming in contact with a continually changing throng of people, aside from his permanent associates, yet the same lack of intimate acquaintance with his personality noticed in America seems to have been also pervading England. The sketches and biographies that have accumulated since his death in 1894 are not uniform in their delineation of him, but from the chronicles of his friends we picture him as gentle, self-effacing, unassuming, and as one who had received in full measure the quality usually inherent in a hyper-sensitive person of being greatly loved by the few and greatly misunderstood by the many. This disagreement of witnesses makes more convincing the summary of his most sympathetic biographers that his best biography is to be found in his own literary work. In his essay on "Style" Pater says:—

Mind and soul:—hard to ascertain philosophically, the distinction is real enough practically for they often interfere, are sometimes in conflict, with each other . . . As a quality, at all events, soul is a fact, in certain writers—the way they have of absorbing language, of attracting it, into the peculiar spirit they are of, with a subtlety which makes the actual result seem like some inexplicable inspiration.

Characteristic of Pater is this faculty of attracting words into his own peculiar spirit. His work is frequently referred to as "autobiographical" but is so only in the same sense that his tales are biographical of their characters. Radical changes in one's material conditions or environment often leave the spirit apparently untouched, while little things, the sunlight casting a certain shadow, a color, a perfume, the atmosphere of an empty room, by their impression upon the senses convey to the

spirit within a message that renders the "visible more visible than ever before, just because the soul has come to the surface." To Pater these were the incidents in life worth recording, and there is much autobiography of that sort in his writings. The following passage from "The Child in the House" seems to throw light upon his own childhood and mental development:—

He pored over the pictures in religious books, and knew by heart the exact mode in which the wrestling angel grasped Jacob, how Jacob looked in his mysterious sleep, how the bells and pomegranates were attached to the hem of Aaron's vestment, sounding sweetly as he glided over the turf of the holy place. His way of conceiving religion came then to be in effect what it ever remained — a sacred history indeed, but still more a sacred ideal, a transcendent version or representation, under intenser and more expressive light and shade, of human life and its familiar or exceptional incidents, birth, death, marriage, youth, age, tears, joy, rest, sleep, waking — a mirror, towards which men might turn away their eyes from vanity and dullness, and see themselves therein as angels, with their daily bread and drink even, become a kind of sacred transaction — a complimentary strain or burden; applied to our every-day existence whereby the stray snatches of music in it re-set themselves and fall into the scheme of some higher and more consistent harmony. A place adumbrated itself in his thoughts, wherein those sacred personalities which are at once the reflex and the patterns of our nobler phases of life housed themselves; and this region in his intellectual scheme all subsequent experience did but tend still further to realize and define. Some ideal hieratic person he would always need to occupy it and keep a warmth there. And he could hardly understand those who felt no such need at all, finding themselves quite happy without such heavenly companionship, and sacred double of their life beside them.

Thus a constant substitution of the typical for the actual took place in his thoughts. Angels might be met by the way, under English elm or beech tree; mere messengers seemed like angels, bound on celestial errands: a deep mysticity brooded over real meetings and partings; marriages were made in heaven: and deaths also with hands of angels thereupon to bear soul and body quietly asunder, each to its appointed rest. All the acts and accidents of daily life borrowed a sacred colour and significance; the very colour of things became themselves weighty with meanings like the sacred stuffs of Moses' tabernacle, full of penitence or peace. Sentiment, congruous in the first instance only with those divine transactions, the deep effusive unction of the House of Bethany was assumed as the due attitude for the reception of our every-day existence; and for a time he walked

through the world in a sustained, not unpleasurable awe generated by the habitual recognition, beside every circumstance and event of life, of its celestial counterpart.

A portion of his description of Leonardo da Vinci might in its essence be applicable to himself: —

His art if it was to be something in this world must be weighted with more of the meaning of nature, and purpose of humanity — he brooded over the hidden virtues of plants, crystals, the lines traveled by the stars as they moved in the sky, over the correspondence which exists between the different orders of living things, through which, to eyes opened they interpret each other; and for years he seemed to those about him as one listening to a voice silent for other men.

An impressive feature of Pater's work is its unity. Writing on a diversity of subjects, including fiction as well as criticisms of art and literature, through it all runs the theme that in everything, both in nature and the work of man, there is an active principle, or dynamic force, of which its outer appearance is but a manifestation. This unseen force he variously termed "indwelling soul," "active principle," "actuating motive," "intellectual formula," "form," and in his later writings, "spiritual form," which he explained was an expression he had "borrowed from William Blake." Whatever name he gave this force it was to him a reality which he was striving to bring to the realization of others, and as there was no technical language to express it, no phrase that would have an exact meaning for every one, he labored with utmost care that each word used should have just the meaning he wished to convey. Much has been said and written of his custom of polishing his sentences, and it might be added that he polished his words, for brushing aside the accumulated significations that attach themselves to a word in its local and universal usage, he used it either in its original or philosophical meaning, to the mystification of some of his less accurate readers, who misinterpret him by construing his language into its most common significance. Especially noticeable is this in his use of the word "form" which to many, perhaps to most people is simply a synonym of shape or external

outline. With that thought in mind they naturally base the imputation of "sensuousness" upon his frequent use of it, but a careful reading and comparison of his different writings is convincing that to Pater the word had a much deeper significance.

Swedenborg says:—

Esse is not *Esse* unless it exists, because before this it is not in a form, and if not in a form it has no quality; and what has no quality is not anything. That which exists from *Esse*, for the reason that it is from *Esse* makes one with it. From this there is a uniting of the two into one, — and from this each is the other's mutually and interchangeably and each is wholly in all things of the other as it is in itself. (*Divine Love and Wisdom*, n. 15.)

By substance is also meant form; for substance is not possible apart from form. (*Ibid.*, n. 209.)

Form in this sense and its necessity was with Pater a dominating thought; in "Plato and Platonism" he says:—

In the creation of philosophical literature, as in all other products of art, *form*, in the full signification of that word, is everything, and the mere matter is nothing.

In "Gaston De Latour" sincerity is referred to as "counting for life-giving *form* whatever the matter might be."

Music is non-existent until form wisely selecting tones weaves them into melody, therefore music is the greatest of all arts, for in it is "the perfect identification of matter and form." Within every word and metaphor is form, and with an exquisite insight denied to those who attribute fashions entirely to caprice he observed that,—

The power of "fashions" as it is called is but one minor form, slight enough it may be, yet distinctly symptomatic of that deeper yearning of human nature toward ideal perfection which is a continuous force in it. (Marius the Epicurean.)

Many other instances might be cited of his using the term after the manner of Swedenborg, but there is no authority for asserting that the trend of his thought was induced by reading Swedenborg's writings, though it may have been intensified, for

his own work gives evidence that they were not unknown to him.

In 1866 appeared a slight essay on Coleridge's prose which was the first of Pater's writing to be published; and in 1880 he wrote a criticism of Coleridge's poetry as an introduction to the group of poems by that author included in Ward's "English Poets." Later these two essays were combined and printed as one in a volume entitled "Appreciations," and in this essay as well as in the introduction to Ward's collection may be found the following tribute to Swedenborg: —

Some one once asked William Blake, to whom Coleridge has many resemblances, when either is at his best (that whole episode of the inspirit-
ing of the ship's crew in *The Ancient Mariner*, being comparable to Blake's well-known design of the morning stars singing together), whether he had ever seen a ghost, and was surprised when the famous seer, who ought, one might think, to have seen so many, answered frankly, "Only one!" His "spirits," at once more delicate, and so much more real than any ghost — at once the burden and the privilege of his temperament — like it, were an integral element in his every-day life. And the difference of mood expressed in that question and its answer is indicative of a change of temper in regard to the supernatural, which has passed over the whole modern mind, and of which the true measure is the influence of the writings of Swedenborg, and what that change is we may see, if we compare the vision by which Swedenborg was called as he thought to his work, with the ghost which called Hamlet; or the spells of Marlowe's *Faust* with those of Gœthe's.

In his essay on Dante Gabriel Rossetti there is another appreciative reference to Swedenborg, where in describing the manner in which men make their dwelling-place a part of themselves by the life they bring to it, and the associations that gather he says: —

— the house which one must quit yet taking perhaps how much of its quietly active light and colour along with us! — grown now to be a kind of raiment to one's body, as the body, according to Swedenborg is but the raiment of the soul.

Another reference proving Pater's familiarity with Swedenborg's writings is found in the essay on "Style" which aroused

so much comment when, in 1888, it first appeared in *The Fortnightly Review*. The essay is included in "Appreciations," with the following reference unchanged:—

Religious history presents many remarkable instances in which, through no mere phrase-worship an unconscious literary tact has, for the sensitive laid open a privileged pathway from one to another — *The Vulgate*, the English Bible, the English Prayer Book, the writings of Swedenborg, the Tracts for the Times — there we have instances of widely different and largely different phases of religious feeling in operation as such in style.

In strong contrast to earlier writers Pater, without apology, or trace of patronage, seems to take as a matter of course the reader's acquaintance with Swedenborg, and the unassuming way in which his name is introduced is indicative of the tendency of the modern mind to accept him and his work as a part of the world's intellectual heritage, even though his message is not accepted in its totality. Notwithstanding the remarkable discriminating valuation of Swedenborg shown in his references to him, there is no reason for believing that Pater was especially interested in the New Church as an organization or that he realized that Swedenborg's philosophy and theology are indissoluble.

It is said of Pater, that at school he won the appellation of "that saintly boy" by his fondness for reading both historical and meditative religious books; in early manhood his deeply religious nature revolted from theology, but in later life he became reconciled to the Established Church, possibly from a desire for an outward expression of religion as much as from profound sympathy with its particular tenets.

Probably his interest in Swedenborg's writings was purely intellectual, but his sympathy with their philosophy may be a potent force in overcoming prejudice, and in preparing the way for a larger acceptance of it, for there is no doubt that his works have been, and are increasingly influential.

To read the criticisms of Pater is to be reminded of the three fabulous blind men who described an elephant from the sense of touch. As one had touched its trunk, another its side, and

another its ear, their descriptions were diverse, but no more so than the estimates of Pater. In 1893, the editor of the London *Daily Chronicle* aroused the curiosity of an aspiring author by congratulating him upon the fact that his recent book was to be "reviewed by the greatest writer in the world," and when the review appeared it proved to have been written by Pater. That he was great is generally admitted, but in what his greatness consisted opinions differ. Two of his personal friends, Walter Blackburn Harte and William Sharp, voice contrasting views, the former says: —

Pater is pre-eminently a stylist, with a delightful indifference about what is going on in the world to-day.

William Sharp whose intimacy with Pater was particularly close and happy, seeing another side, or looking deeper says: —

In no writer of our time is there more tenderness, more loving heed of human struggle, aspiration, failure, heroic effort, high achievement, more profound understanding of the thing that is behind the thing, above all a keener, a more alive, a more swift and comprehensive sympathy. . . . Nothing irritated Pater more than to be called a mere stylist. He was a thinker first, and a rare and distinguished stylist by virtue of his thought, for after all style is simply the rainbow light created by the thought, and is pure, transparent, precise and beautiful, or is intermittent, incoherent crudely interfused even as in the thought.

Sharp adds the following recognition of Pater's habitual probing beneath the surface: —

It is his apprehension of, his insight into, this subtle profoundly intimate second-life in every manifestation of human life and nature, of the warm shadow as well as of the sunlit flower; of the wandering voice as well as of the spring harbinger, that is one secret of the immediate appeal of Walter Pater's work to all who not only love what is beautiful, whatever and however embodied but also, as a Celtic saying has it, "look at the thing that is believed the thing."

A writer in *The Nation* reviewing Greenslet's "Walter Pater" says: —

The scheme and vision which he offers may seem to the Philistine foolishness — the merest and vaguest moonshine: his voice and message faint and alien, preposterously faint; but the more preposterous, perhaps, the deeper the need. His is one of those still small voices that call us back to things beautiful and enduring; it is a faint and distant bell that tolls in some deserted shrine the passing of ideals or summons to the worship of things forgotten for the moment but of the essence of man's soul and spirit, and hence imperishable and divine.

A writer in *The Dial* adds another protest against his being altogether a stylist, saying: —

He was not a mere stylist, most of the critical judgments in his works on "The Renaissance" and "Plato and Platonism" are sound and the scholarship evinced in "Marius the Epicurean" is genuine and broad; yet nothing of haste or shoddiness mars his thought or its expression.

In appreciation of his influence Richard Le Gallienne, himself an artist in the mosaic of words, says: —

The man in the street knows nothing of the "Studies in Renaissance," "Marius the Epicurean," or the "Imaginary Portraits," yet in subtle indirect fashion these books will influence his children's children. Mr. Pater is one of those literary springs, "occult withdrawn" at which the best of our younger writers have secretly drunk. He is like the unseen hand in Bunyan pouring unacknowledged oil upon the flame of their various talents.

Few authors inspire a more enthusiastic partisanship in their admirers than Pater and one is tempted to continue quoting the appreciative estimates of him, but a fitting close seems Mr. A. C. Benson's description of him as: —

One who, through a dreamful and unpraised boyhood, through a silent and undistinguished youth, gradually discerned a principle in things; learned to see with an impassioned zest the truth that in art and life alike, the victory is with those who attain to a certain patient and appreciative attitude of soul; who learn through careful toil, through much sorting of accumulated thought and expression, to discriminate between what is facile, impressive, specious, and what is deep, permanent, sincere. No taste can of course be wholly catholic; it is swayed by instinct prepossession, and preference. But the point is, in however limited a sphere to be able to detect with unflinching certainty the true greatness of things.

He of whom we speak achieved this art of subtle discrimination, a gift which is shared by dumb and learned connoisseurs, but above this rise a few, who can not only by a trained instinct recognize what is perfect, but who can express their methods and powers so that canons and standards can be formed. Then to but one or two in a generation is given a further gift, the creative, the poetical power to express in language of high and haunting beauty the deepest mysteries of art; who can not only praise in noble and inspiring terms the beautiful thing, the exquisite work, the flashing thought, but can disentangle the very essence of the secret, establish remote and subtle connection, and open, if only for one glorious instant, a door into the inner shrine, showing a vision of awful angels, bent on high service, interpreting the loud crying of mysterious voices, echoing the rising strain that fills the golden-roofed palace, and giving perhaps an awe-struck glimpse of the presence that sits enthroned there.

EMILY ROBBINS SUGDEN.

THE INNER LIFE.

THERE is nothing more common or familiar to us than life and there are few things less understood. It is all about us and within us and yet we know not what it is except as we recognize its various forms of manifestation.* From certain observed effects we can distinguish the various forms of life and can give to these forms their appropriate names. The things that have life in the world about us we call forms of physical life and of these forms we can in most cases clearly distinguish the forms of animal life from the forms of vegetable life. Animal life again is manifested in many forms known under various names. Man takes upon himself one of these forms called the life of the body. But he manifests another form of life—the life of the mind—which is known as intellectual, emotional, or volitional life, depending upon the kind of mental activity exercised. Forms of mental life may also be known by the quality of that life. We may for example, speak of a man leading a good life or a bad life and the kinds of life upon this basis may be of the greatest possible variety, ranging from the worst to the best kinds imaginable. Some of these kinds of human life may be considered as types and will be described mainly for the purpose of indicating more clearly what is meant by certain names which will be used later.

The first type of life to be considered is that of childhood. The most prominent characteristic of the child's life as compared with the life of an adult is a want of responsibility or rational freedom. His life is made up not so much of what he does for himself as of what is done for him. The natural con-

* Definitions of life are not wanting but none of them helps us to know what life really is, not even Spencer's well-known definition which tells us that "Life is the continuous adjustment of internal to external relations." Nor does the statement that "Life is love," however true it may be, help us much to know what life is so long as the real nature of love is unknown.

trol of his acts by parents and guardians unite with the tendencies imposed upon him by nature and heredity, to lessen his individual responsibility. The beginning of his physical life is imposed upon him without his consent and the desire to continue that life for no other end than that of living is his by nature. For the fullest and best increase of his storehouse of knowledge his perceptive powers while he is young are relatively very active. That is, he seeks that knowledge mainly which can be gained through the senses. Facts of the physical world are at first of greatest interest to him and he readily stores them in his memory for future use.

Later the facts gained by perception are made the basis of other states of mind known as abstraction, imagination, and reasoning. With these thinking processes come states of emotions and desires of all kinds and degrees. Following the child's life into the domain of his volitions, we find him having certain self-centering tendencies of thoughts and efforts — tendencies which grow in scope and which come more and more within his control. This power of freedom like that of rationality constantly grows with his advancing years until they are found in their fulness in mature manhood.

From all this we see that both in mind and in body growth and change come to the child but that they come largely by nature and for purposes mainly of preparation for adult life.

If we look more closely at the child's life, we see evidences of protection and guidance of a more internal kind without which the influences of heredity and environment might drag him down later. These internal influences for good were described at length in a previous article.*

Passing now from this type of immature human life to types of mature manhood, we have first to consider the class typified by one who not only does not resist but who encourages in all possible ways a natural inclination to regard the good things of life of paramount interest; and by the good things of life he means above everything else those things that appeal to his

* See NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, Vol. IX, pp. 330, 331.

senses, both in his amusements and in the satisfactions of his appetites. Every other consideration but that of selfish gratification is put aside. Not even do the conventionalities of society or the laws of the land entirely restrain him from those excesses which tend to bring him down to the level of beasts. This type may be said to be the type of a *sensuous life*.

Another type of mature manhood is seen in the life of a man who controls his appetites within conventional limits and who in other respects leads outwardly an honorable life. All the commandments of the decalogue are faithfully kept by him, but not in consideration of their Divine source. He keeps them solely on account of his reputation, because any violation of them would tend to bring upon him the disfavor of men. He may go still further in a show of outward goodness by giving more or less freely to causes of charity. Here again his good deeds are done on account of the reputation they give him. The world proclaims him as a dispenser of charities and gives him due credit therefor. Sometimes on account of his good name and sometimes by the help of his friends who expect to be rewarded, he secures the honors of his fellow men in the form of a public office, the duties of which are performed more for his own good than for the good of the public. The life of such a man may be said to be a *moral life*, even though it be manifestly a selfish one.

There is another type of moral life which may be considered somewhat higher than the one just mentioned. It is the life of a man who is upright in all respects; but instead of being moved to good deeds by fear of a loss of reputation he does them because of a "good disposition" which he has inherited or because of his own ideas of justice and right. Lies are not told by him and goods are not stolen, because he believes that lying and stealing are not honorable. His natural sense of justice is violated by those and other forms of injustice to others, and his purpose is in all things to put the rights of others along side of his own, whenever a question of right is involved. At most times the good done in his own strength seems sufficient.

But there are times of trial in which there is an inevitable yielding in the direction of self-advantage. In social and business affairs there are bound to come situations in which the high ideals which he had formed will not find expression to the degree of helping his neighbor as he helps himself. At times too, he believes himself unfairly treated, and feels that strict justice demands retaliation on his part. Too often this retaliation involves a spirit quite unlike a spirit of genuine love. In other words the good that he does is unstable and uncertain and his strength fails when he is in most need of strength. The cause of this uncertainty is not hard to find. At heart there is in all his relations with men self love and self dependence, which in the doing of good are imperfect and unreliable.

Looking now at these types of lives we see in them all qualities of selfishness, different in degree to be sure, but at the same time so unmistakably alike in essence that they may be regarded as one life. A life whose center of thought and effort is self. For want of a better name this life may be called an external or natural life as distinguished from an inner or spiritual life.

It should be borne in mind that the term "natural" is not used here in its primitive sense or in a sense which implies that a self-centered life is according to nature and that any other kind is not. It is used rather as St. Paul uses it when he says that "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him." To such a man any motive of human conduct beyond a simply moral one is supernatural and therefore has no place for men on earth. The word "spiritual" also as it is here used, and as it will be used in the following pages has a special meaning quite different from the meaning usually given to it.* Spiritual life is not merely psychical

* The popular notions of spirituality are well shown by answers to a question given to college students by Professor Coe [The Spiritual Life, pp. 232-234]. The question was: "First think of some one whom you would call spiritual in the religious sense. Then (after a pause) write down without revision or criticism what it was in that person that seemed to show his spirituality." In 70 answers there were 109 specifications put by Professor Coe into 13 separate

or mental life as distinguished from animal life. It does not mean a life having the outward characteristics only of certain virtues, such as kindness to others or an exercise of charity or good will. Especially should not the word spiritual as applied to the life of man be so restricted as to mean only existence in another world, for a genuine spiritual life or life of the spirit may be begun and continued in this world.

Again states of life sometimes known as sub-conscious or subliminal should not be classed as spiritual, for an analysis of them, however shadowy they may appear, is found sometimes to be most gross and material.

What then is the chief characteristic of the inner or spiritual life as possible to men in this world? If it were possible to answer this question in a single sentence it might be by saying that it is a life actuated by a genuine love of God — a simple statement of religious obligation frequently heard from the pulpit and in the Sunday-school, easy enough to accept in the abstract, but as applied to every day life not easy or common. We know that the personal love with which we are most familiar cannot be promoted by force or words of command; rather is it hindered by such means, and yet we are commanded in our scriptures to love God. What difference if any is there between this love which we are commanded to give to God and the love which we have for our personal friends?

There are two ways of loving a person. We may have a kind feeling toward him merely because his presence or what he does for us contributes to our pleasure. Such a feeling, if it can be called love, is a love not of him but of ourselves. It is a love essentially selfish and therefore actuates what I have called the

classes, most of them being qualities or characteristics which according to standards of spirituality set forth in this paper are non-spiritual or uncertain; such for example are the virtues named in the class of answers that had the highest number of votes, namely: "Social feeling and activity, such as sympathy, influence for good, etc." These qualities may be spiritual but not necessarily so and the passive virtues of gentleness, even temper, cheerfulness, regarded as characteristics of spirituality by the next largest number may be qualities possessed by natural-minded men.

natural life. The other way of loving a person is to make him and not ourselves the object of our thoughts and feelings. His qualities of mind and life attract us and there springs up in us a desire to coöperate with him in his life and to help him in the attainment of his highest and best good, including his greatest happiness. This love it is which actuates the inner or spiritual life of a man — “the life which consisteth not in the abundance which he possesseth,” not in what he has by getting from others but in what he gives to others. It is this love that most resembles in kind the love which God gives to men. This true love of the neighbor is but the expression of that love to God which we are commanded to have. These two loves therefore, love of God and love of neighbor — loves which cannot be separated must find expression in some form of life. But how can such a love of God be applied or expressed in our daily life? It is here that one’s religion, if it have any place in the world, has its highest function. It is to little purpose for man to acknowledge God’s goodness and power as a guide unless such acknowledgment inspires his whole mind of thinking, feeling, and willing in helping him to lead a better life, and to lead that life more enduringly. The question of questions which man has to answer for himself is whether the Higher Power or the power of self shall be recognized as the source of the good he may do. It cannot be answered for him by any one but himself. The final choice for good or ill cannot be transmitted by inheritance or be imposed upon him by environment. To neither of these influences, however effective it may be as a shaper of the forms of his life, can he attribute credit or blame for the essential quality of that life. Nought will suffice for the determination of his life’s ruling love, but the exercise of his God-given power of freedom in the light of his own rationality also given him from above. But what is meant by the “life’s ruling love”? There is an implication in the words that one’s acts are controlled by known motives and that the controlling motives are always alike. This does not mean that the motives of men are entirely single or that they are the same at all times. Some of

our deeds are, no doubt, prompted by mixed motives, and oftentimes by no conscious motive whatever. Again the life of to-day seems to be controlled by a love different from the controlling love of yesterday. And yet at no time in our life can there be said to be wanting a predominating motive or love in one direction or another, in the direction either of some real or fancied selfish advantage or of some good to others without thought of return. This predominating love may not be overpowering or very manifest to others, but it controls or affects in some degree our thoughts and feelings in the every day affairs of life. It is this quality of love which we may, if we choose, clearly distinguish in ourselves. We can tell for example whether we buy and sell goods, or make speeches or paint pictures primarily for the sake of service to others, or for the sake of some selfish interest. The same test may be made of our social life. Is the call upon neighbors, or the invitation to friends to visit us, or the doing of favors to others, really from a sincere regard for the interests of others or is it all done in expectation of a return? A genuine answer to these questions will determine whether the life is natural or spiritual.

It will be observed that the only test of spirituality in man's life thus far considered is its inner motive or love independent of its outward form. If man's discernments were reliable, if he could always see the real quality of his life, no doubt this test would be sufficient. But his discernments of spiritual values are not always clear. His judgments, especially of the real quality of his own thinking and living are undeveloped and unreliable. Therefore it helps him to judge himself and the world spiritually to apply to life a further and to him a clearer test, that of usefulness or service. By such a test he discovers that there is much of vocational and social life in which there is no spirituality or preparation for spirituality, because it is of no real service to any one judged from the standpoint either of physical or of spiritual well being. Especially does he see that the spirit has no part in a work which hinders rather than helps men to lead wholesome, clean, and honest lives.

It will thus be seen that an essential element of the inner life is an unselfish spirit of service, and that this spirit of service is determined by the ruling motive or love independent of the form of service rendered. Incidental to this spirit of service but scarcely less important is a living faith in the Divine ordering of things. I say living faith to distinguish it from a merely superficial or emotional faith which is so frequently expressed in words but not in daily living. Again that is not a living faith which does not recognize the hand of Providence in the little events of life as well as in the great ones, in the untoward circumstances as well as in those which men commonly regard as favorable. The health of an apparently dying man is restored, unexpected help comes to a family in want, a changing wind saves a burning city; and men uncover their heads in pious adoration and exclaim "how providential!" seemingly regarding other and minor events as the results of chance or as matters of course. Still more difficult is it to connect the Divine Influence directly with the lives of ordinary men and women. It is easy to see the hand of Divine Providence in the lives of such men as Washington and Lincoln while our own lives seem so insignificant as to be altogether disconnected from Divine guidance.

There are doubtless persons who fail to see the reason for needing any other standard than that of the higher moral life outlined above. They may acknowledge that such a life lived in the world is sometimes not altogether just or reliable, but they do not see why it may not be just and reliable, or why any other than a natural life is needed. They argue that such and such a feeling or impulse is natural and why is it not therefore a safe guide.

Finite love is only an image and likeness of infinite love. Its very nature is therefore imperfect. If the loves of man were perfect and his power to control those loves complete, he might regard himself as a source of good and therefore a proper object of worship, what in fact some men in their imperfection and weakness now appear to do. But man is not left powerless.

To serve the highest ends of existence he is free to choose between higher and lower loves. He is given also rationality by which he is able to see the difference between the two and to know how best to apply them. To enable him to free his life from selfish tendencies he is permitted to do good deeds in his vocation and in other relations, not from himself as a source lest he arrogate to himself power which cannot belong to finite beings, but *as of himself only*, in the name of a higher power and in the acknowledgment that the power to do good belongs only to God. But, again it is urged that the states from heredity and environment do not permit some persons to have a glimpse even of the higher life. In all likelihood no one born with a mind capable of thinking and choosing has ever lived, who has not had given him higher and lower standards of conduct from which to choose his own ideals. As Maeterlink says: "In the life of every man has there been a day when the heavens opened of their own accord, and it is almost always from that very instant that dates his true spiritual personality." (*The Treasure of the Humble*, p. 172.)

This first opening of the heavens, this first awakening of a life of the spirit, is occasioned, it may be, by a sound of the wind or waters coming as a voice from the Great Spirit, by the chant of a muezzin calling the faithful to prayer, or by the prayer or song of the Salvation Army appealing to the heart of the poorest and lowest. Or it may be that the beginning of spiritual consciousness first comes to a man from hearing the word or seeing the act of some struggling soul a little higher than he, or from his first thrill of victory over some base impulse. Somehow and at some time, it is reasonable to suppose, is the inner life of every human being first stirred to action for the struggle for supremacy which may follow between the higher and lower forces of his nature.

There is a widely accepted theory among some philosophically minded people that there is nothing done by men which is not actuated by self interest. If by self interest is meant interest in realizing what is sometimes called the higher self as

well as the lower self, the statement perhaps cannot be denied; but if it means that self interest is synonymous with selfishness in the common acceptation of that term then must the statement be wholly untrue, for if it were true that selfish loves only can actuate the words and deeds of men, the loftiest principles of religion that we know would be false, the whole idea of service in its best sense would be perverted and the highest enjoyment known to the saints of earth would be impossible.

But strictly speaking we cannot refer to the higher part of our nature as the "higher self" inasmuch as the spiritual man disclaims all merit in what he does preferring to attribute to a Higher Power all the good that he does and to be thankful that he is permitted to exercise the power for good only as if it were his own.

All religions have their standards of inner thought and life, and all look to a greater or less extent to conflict and final peace. Christians of course believe themselves especially blessed in the spiritual standards and promises set before them. Indeed, the burden of the entire Scriptures seems to dwell upon the conflict between higher and lower parts of man's nature, and upon the blessings promised for those whose higher natures are in the ascendancy.

The victory of the inner life over the outer, or of the spiritual over the natural, is sometimes referred to as conversion and sometimes as the new birth or regeneration. It does not mean that the lower nature of man is in itself evil, but that the loves of this lower nature are subordinated by conflict to the higher loves of the Lord and neighbor. "Except ye be converted (turn) and become as little children, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven." This process of regeneration is a long one, sometimes continuing through an entire earthly life. It includes in its operation a change of view from the self-centered or thoughtless act to the act, be it word or deed, that is prompted by a genuinely unselfish love. It includes also in its scope as we have seen a complete change of all natural states even those which are commonly called good states, like cheerfulness or a good disposition.

What has been said of the possibilities and beginning of the spiritual life implies the possession of two quite different kinds of mind — a natural mind and a spiritual mind. So different are these minds that one cannot be said to be an outgrowth of the other. That is, any improvement or development of the natural mind cannot result in a mind called spiritual and any refinement of selfish or worldly states cannot produce states whose centre of interest is love of the Lord and neighbor. And yet it is true that the facts and principles gained by the natural powers may be used as a means of spiritual training — the only difference between the acquisitions of the two minds being the uses or ends which they serve.

To outward appearance therefore the two minds like the two lives, which we have considered are similar. The natural mind may, so far as expression goes, appear as pure and truthful as the spiritual mind appears. Indeed, it frequently happens that by popular standards the action of the natural mind is superior to that of the spiritual mind especially in keenness and attractiveness.

There are different gradations of the two minds. It is plain to see the nature of these degrees in the natural mind, ranging from powers capable of the grossest evils to powers whose selfish operations are so refined as to be scarcely distinguishable from virtues essentially spiritual. It is fair to assume that there are similar gradations of the spiritual mind. Indeed, it is not beyond the bounds of reason to believe that the highest planes of the spiritual mind form a means of union between all lower states and the Lord Himself. If it is true that the kingdom of God is within man we may well believe that it is in these highest planes of the mind that the influence of the Lord and His angels are exerted and that without this union with the Divine, man could not live and grow spiritually. The mistake is sometimes made of thinking of this highest plane of man's mind as Divine and thus of regarding man as a part of God, an error which carried to its logical conclusions would place limits upon the Infinite and make man Divine.

The spiritual mind of man may be thought of as innate or undeveloped during childhood. As regeneration begins it appears, and becomes more and more active as regeneration advances. During this period of regeneration the two minds, natural and spiritual, act together as one mind and the mental process is called natural or spiritual according to the ruling motive. At first the mental processes are natural because of the mind's immaturity. In this formative period external and selfish ends are sought and apparent good is the only good known. After the child comes to the age of freedom and rationality the nature of the mental processes depends upon the ruling love — natural if the ruling love is essentially selfish or worldly, and spiritual if the ruling love is love of the Lord and neighbor. Thus it is that early in regeneration there is constant action and reaction of the two minds resulting in alternating states of rest and unrest, of selfish indulgence and unselfish devotion to others, while in later stages of regeneration through victories of the spirit the conflict ceases and there follow states of peace and quiet enjoyment of unending service.

In all these experiences it should be understood that the spiritual mind no less than the natural thinks, feels, and wills, and that these activities are not confined to exercises connected with religious observances. Indeed, an active life in the world is needed for the fullest exercise of these powers of the spirit, for without such a life the highest aspirations of the soul may be dissipated.

There is another aspect of these spiritual powers which should be kept in mind and that is their total disregard of natural standards. The natural mind thrives best in kinds of work which attract the observation and applause of the world and it is well nigh powerless in the humbler callings of life. But not so the powers of the spirit. In that realm the thinking may be clear and straight, the feeling warm and sympathetic, and the willing strong under any outward circumstances — in the field and workshop quite as much as in the pulpit and forum.

But it is not in outward expression only that the life of the spirit is tested and promoted; not alone in the business of the world is the inward strife with evil always most actively carried on. In times of quiet meditation when the events of life are passed in review and when hopes and plans for the future are being formed are the powers of the inner mind most free. They are most free at such times because they are not turned aside or subdued by urgent natural conditions. Sometimes in the silent watches of the night and in the quiet periods of the day, both in the leisure and in the working time, is the true quality of one's thoughts and desires shaped and tested. Then if ever he may know himself as he really is. Then it is that he may cultivate one or the other of two lives. He may make more sordid and mean his natural life by dwelling upon the interests of self, or he may promote the inner life of the spirit in such a way that he may live in a world quite unlike the world in which his body lives and at the same time he may enrich and ennoble the life of this world.

Having seen to some extent the operations of the inner life we are ready to consider some of its essential characteristics. In the first place there is genuine *power* in the words and deeds of men animated by a devotion to spiritual service. Low aims may be pursued for a time with feverish zeal but achievement under such circumstances is rarely far reaching or vital: whereas the pursuit of ends which involve the improvement of spiritual conditions of an individual or people touches the springs of human conduct and extends to all planes of life. Witness the power of Savonarola, Joan of Arc, Cromwell, Comenius, and a host of others whose efforts to reform men in various fields in the name of religion were attended with results which will be felt to the remotest time. Even in quieter ways is the power of the spirit most marked. This is manifest especially when the uppermost windows of the soul are opened to heaven in the common experiences of life. It may be by reverently reading the Word of God or by repeating some portion of it when disturbed in body and soul, or it may be in sanctifying the daily

duties both in general and in particular by repeating one or more of the scriptural prayers which have been committed to memory. Then, as at no other time, we realize that "it is the spirit that quickeneth."

A second element of superiority which can be claimed for the spiritual life is *clearness of vision*. This is made evident by common experience. The man who is most deeply in earnest in ultimating in a good life his religious principles has the clearest view both of the highest ends of life and of the means of attaining them. He may be blind to the ways of greatness as the world counts greatness, but all is clear as to things of the spirit. His purity of heart gives him the vision promised in the beatitude and his daily life exemplifies the doctrine that "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." So it is that in our severest trials we go for words of truest wisdom, not to the great and powerful, but to them whose ideals are the highest and whose lives are sanctified by the spirit of genuine love.

A third marked accompaniment or result of an active exercise of the spiritual mind is *peace*. This claim for peace, like that for power and clearness of vision, is supported by common experience. No one who has had the opportunity of comparing the states of feeling which attend the two kinds of life here described can doubt for a moment that it is the life of the spirit only which puts men into possession of a peace which passeth all understanding. Both the source and the nature of this element of the inner life are assured to us in the memorable words of one who alone perfectly lived that life in the world. "Peace I leave with you," He said, "My peace I give unto you," and they only who are in possession of this peace know that "it is not as the world giveth."

And finally there is a degree of *steadfastness and permanence* of pursuit in a life of the spirit quite unknown in a life dominated by lower loves. The changeableness and uncertainty of a self-centred life are well known, the ends in such a life being sought at times with great interest only to be dropped or changed as soon as the novelty wears away. Thus it is that

good natural intentions may be changed to those that are less good and even to those that are harmful when only natural interests are involved. On the other hand good purposes carried into life in the name of God from love to Him and the neighbor endure forever. It is as a gift from above "and cometh down from the Father of lights with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Well may it be called, as it is so frequently in the Bible, "Eternal Life."

This, then, is the inner life, or life of the spirit. It knows no difference of times or places or conditions. The humblest laborer and the highest official may alike share its victories and its joys. By means of it the messages of God to men are received and at no time in the world's history has this connection between God and man been wanting. Now as never before are the signs of a quickening of the spirit manifest in the world. They are seen in the gradual breaking down of sectarian barriers and the broadening charity of men toward each other's opinions, in the efforts of men in all countries to secure universal peace, in the bettering of the conditions of living among all people, in the growth of a better understanding between employers and employees, in short, in the awakening everywhere, of a spirit of freedom and self government. All these conditions have not been brought about for their own sake, desirable as they may be. They are but the precursors of and preparation for the universal awakening of the innermost spirit of men in the earth even as it is in heaven.

JOHN T. PRINCE.

WHAT THE CONSCIENCE IS.

Ask the materialist what the conscience is, and he will tell you that it is a state of the mind due to melancholy, or states of anxiety caused by vitiated blood. Those who live irreligiously think that the fear experienced lest one's evil deeds become known and he suffer loss of honor, gain, or be punished, is conscience. But conscience is not such, nor has it such an origin. Some who are religious and have good moral qualities, think that conscience is the pain felt when they have knowingly done wrong; but the conscience is not pain.

To understand what the conscience is, we should know its origin. The people of the Most Ancient Church, or in that time known as before the fall, did not have conscience. They loved what is good and true, and from that love they perceived what is right. Their love was a light unto them. So instead of conscience they enjoyed perception in clear light.

After the fall, that is, after the heredity had become infilled with evil, making the perception all erroneous, it became necessary for the Lord to provide a new means of leading mankind. When heaven became closed, and the Lord could no longer communicate with us openly, He provided means to speak to us in a covered way, in a cloud. That way is through the conscience.

Now to see what the conscience is, we must understand how it is formed.

The conscience does not exist from birth. We are not born into any conscience. The true conscience is something of the Lord's building. It is implanted after birth, and is developed and perfected throughout life. That the conscience might be formed and developed, the Lord has provided truths, which we are enjoined to believe, do, and love. The will into which we are born is depraved, turned away from the Lord and heaven to self and the world. A new will is to be formed, which pri-

marily regards the neighbour and the Lord. As we do and love the truths of the Word, the Lord forms a new will; that is, a love for things good, true, and unselfish. The new will, the new heart, the new love of the good and the true, is the conscience. The good and true in one is what we all mean by the conscience, when we get away from mere definitions; for we say of one who does evil unfeelingly, that he has no conscience; and of one who is careful not to do wrong, that he has a sensitive and keen conscience. The conscience is the good that the Lord implants in one by means of the truth. By means of the good that the Lord implants, He operates the mind. He inflows into that good, and gives a sense of what is right and just, and what ought to be done, and what ought not to be done.

When one who has conscience does wrong knowingly, he suffers torment. But that pain is not conscience, neither is it from the Lord. The pain comes from evil spirits who inflow by means of the evil done, and attempt to destroy the good implanted by the Lord. And it happens in this wise. Everyone, it is said, is born with a heredity tending to evil. The tendency to evil originates in the form of the natural mind, that form being such as to receive influx from the world and from hell. The finest fibers of the natural mind of the unregenerate are as little spirals bending downward and outward to receive influx from the world, from hell, and from without; but of the regenerated the fibers bend upward and inward to receive influx from heaven and the Lord within. So when evil is done, influx from hell rushes in, and breaks down and turns about toward the world the fibrillæ of the soul, from which comes pain; just as evil lusts destroy the finer fibers of the material brain, disorganize the nerve fibers, and corrupt the blood. In short, all the diseases and weaknesses of the body that have their origin in thinking wrong thoughts and doing evil, are in correspondence with like things that wrong thoughts and desires first do to the organism of the spiritual body. The pain, then, felt when a true conscience is violated, is from the distortion and destruction of interior, spiritual forms by the inflow of evil forces.

The conscience itself is productive of inward joy, tranquillity, and peace, because the Lord inflows into it and produces these. But when the conscience is violated, then evil inflows, and destroys the peace of the Lord, and produces anxiety, torment, and pain. Since the conscience is formed by the Lord planting good in the truths that one learns and does, conscience is a thing of education. It differs according to religious instruction.

We might say that there are three kinds of conscience. First genuine conscience, which is formed by the Lord implanting good in genuine truths. Second, erroneous conscience, which is formed by the Lord implanting good in erroneous conceptions of truth, as with the Gentile races. They have no interior truths, and not much genuine truth, yet they intend well. Where there are wrong ideas, yet good intentions, the Lord can form conscience according to what is thought to be right. From the good thus implanted, when such come into the spiritual world, they can be instructed, and receive genuine truths and genuine conscience. The third kind of conscience is a false conscience. This is a conscience in which there is nothing other than fear lest evils done may be found out, and one suffer loss of honor, power, wealth, or be punished. But such a conscience is not really conscience, any more than a counterfeit dollar is money, or than a brass eagle is gold.

Some have supposed that the torments of hell are the remorse of violated conscience; but those in hell have no conscience. Even in this world those who do evil, and fear lest they be found out and punished, delight in their evil deeds, if they know that they cannot be punished. Instead of pains of conscience, they have either fear of punishment or of loss, or delight in evil, like the delight one feels when he has had revenge satisfied. Consequently those in hell can have neither conscience nor the remorse of violated conscience.

All those who can suffer remorse of conscience come into heaven, for in the degree that they can suffer torment of conscience, in that degree the Lord has established good in them, and in the degree that good is established, to that degree heaven

can be given after death. Those who have any genuine conscience are therefore instructed in the other life. They readily receive the truth, because it is in agreement with the good of their conscience, and then they are elevated into heaven according to their capacity to receive love from the Lord.

Having discussed these things about conscience, we come next to consider the most interesting and practical subject of how conscience acts.

The conscience does not dictate what the truth is, but that a thing learned is true and ought to be done, or that a thing ought not to be done because it is contrary to what has been taught to be right.

With most people the conscience is not a clear dictate. But in conscience what is right is presented as in a cloud. Since the conscience is good from the Lord, He dwells in that good. The impulses of a true conscience are the Lord working in one. The voice of conscience is the voice of the Lord. The Lord appeared in the cloud of incense upon the mercy seat; so He appears in the cloud that obscures His presence in the conscience. "The clouds are the dust of His feet."

The building up of the new will, the turning of one from self to the Lord, is a most delicate process. The Lord could compel anyone to do His will, if He wished; but to compel would destroy the very thing that He wants done. The Lord wants us to do right from our own choice, for only in so doing is there any virtue. We must do right from our own choice and as of ourselves, for what is not done as of our own selves, but from compulsion, does not remain. The new will grows by our laying hold of power from the Lord and using it as of ourselves. So the Lord must make His approach most delicately, lest He exert a force upon us greater than we use as of ourselves. He veils Himself in the conscience, lest He compel or unduly persuade. "Thou hast covered thyself with a cloud," is true of the conscience. So we can define the conscience as the Lord in us veiled in a cloud.

That light of life in which a true conscience sees that a thing

ought or ought not to be done, is light from the Lord within us. That impulsion to do good which one feels within, is the endeavor of the Lord to give us of His will. That inward power which one feels drawing him from evil ways, is the pulling of the Lord's love.

The conscience is the dwelling-place of the Lord in man. It is His temple, in which He speaks to us. If a most loving and valuable friend comes to us, or speaks to us, how careful we are that all our acts shall show our love for Him! How we would grieve if we had been careless, and appeared selfish, unappreciative, or unloving! What then should be our treatment of the voice of conscience! Our riding rough-shod over it, our coldly turning our backs upon it, can be explained in no other way than that we do not realize that it is the voice of God speaking to us. The way we treat our conscience is the way we treat the Lord. If we used other people as we sometimes use our conscience, would they come to us again? Would they speak to us? Yet the Lord keeps coming, coming — knocking, knocking. Surely, "The Lord is gracious, and full of compassion: slow to anger and of great mercy."

But one can silence the voice of conscience. He can so destroy good in him, that the impulsion to do good ceases. And then it is as if the Lord hid His face forever, as the psalmist says.

Children should be taught to listen to the voice of conscience, and never to disobey its dictate; for it will prove to be a safe guide, and if tenderly cherished it will become the evident presence of the Lord.

The conscience admits of great development. It can become exceedingly tender and delicate to feel what is evil. It can grow strong to sense what is good. It can become unerring in its guidings, immeasurably surpassing reason in swiftness and accuracy. It can be the abode of joy, purity, and peace, for its promptings are the endeavor of the Lord to lead us; its voice is the voice of the Lord, and we should look to our conscience as such. It is a loss ever to do violence to it, for it is God with us. It is of the highest profit to cultivate it, for it will grow into a Divine Leadership.

We shall hear its voice, if we listen; if we do not turn the deaf ear of self-love and worldliness. We shall soon be convinced that it is the voice of the Lord, if we follow it. By our following it, the Lord implants more and more good, and increases His love and life in us, from which is the power that triumphs over all evil, and is the good part that shall never be taken away. "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand."

GEORGE HENRY DOLE.

THE FUNCTION OF REVELATION AND REASON IN THE CHURCH.

It was a tenet of the old theologians that "The understanding must be kept under obedience to faith." By this dogma the use of reason in the examination of religious doctrine was forbidden. Faith then became a blind acceptance of whatever the church taught without rational examination into its truth. The doctrines of the church were received without question because it was believed that they were revealed from God, and therefore man's understanding and reason could have no place in the consideration of the teachings of the church.

In the "Doctrine of Faith" Swedenborg calls this a "blind faith," a "faith in what somebody else has said"; but it is not a spiritual faith. We there read: "Real faith is nothing else than an acknowledgment that a thing is so because it is true" (Doctrine of Faith, n. 2). The angels themselves refuse to accept what they do not see to be true. "Angelic wisdom consists solely in this, that the angels see and comprehend what they think." (*Ibid.*, n. 4.)

The leading doctrines in the old theology are both irrational and untrue. The church protected them from criticism by the dogma that the understanding must be kept under obedience to faith; but in the beginning of the church it was entirely different. The Lord came to open the blind eyes that men might see intellectually the things necessary for salvation.

At the present day men refuse to be bound by the old dogma. They are using their reason in the examination of all kinds of intellectual problems. The Roman Catholic Church still endeavors to impose its doctrines on the world by the claim of infallibility and Divine authority. It still holds the terrors of excommunication over the heads of its adherents endeavoring thereby to prevent them from using their reason in the exami-

nation of the dogmas and doctrines of their church. It claims the right to state *ex cathedra* the dogmas and doctrines of the church with divine authority. It holds that human reason has no right to examine and question the truth of these doctrines which are the decrees of the Almighty as revealed through the church.

How long can a church exist which excludes reason from a part in the discussion of its teachings? A curious state of mind is developed in scientists of the Roman Catholic faith. They use their reason freely in matters of natural science; but when it comes to the teachings of the church they are compelled to abnegate the use of their reason in matters of their faith. There are many indications that with them the reason will soon break down this artificial boundary, as it has done in the Protestant churches. When that takes place the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church will go the way that the creeds of the Protestant churches are now going. They will be laid aside as matters not practically believed. Under these circumstances the question arises, What will become of revelation itself in the church? There are many indications in the Protestant churches that the belief in revelation as the means by which God actually communicates Divine truth to men is now being abandoned by many. The reason of this is that the nature of revelation or the Word and the mode by which it was given are not understood. The modern mind is not content to accept revelation on the mere dictate of the prophets and writers of the Word, or on the mere assertion of the old theologians. Statements which seem unreasonable or out of the ordinary modes of natural operations are either rejected or held under suspicion. They are not accepted blindly as in olden times. The modern mind repudiates the old idea that "the understanding must be kept under obedience to faith." Revelation seems to be in danger of being excommunicated from the church.

What is the function of revelation and of reason in the church as these functions are defined in the doctrines of the New Church? What is the place of revelation and what relation does reason bear to revelation?

In the "Coronis" we read:—

In every church there have been four successive changes of state; the first of which was the appearance of the Lord Jehovih and redemption, and then its morning and rise; the second was its instruction, and then its noon or progression; the third was its decline, and then its evening or vastation; the fourth was its end, and then its night or consummation. (Summary, III.)

When a new church is established,

The Lord Jehovih from the new heaven derives and produces a new church on the earth, which is effected by the revelation of truths from his mouth or from his Word, and inspiration. (*Ibid.*, n. 18.)

In an explanation of the nature of redemption, which is a Divine work effected by the Lord alone, we read:—

I. Liberation from enemies in the Word is called redemption.

II. Consequently it is liberation from evils and falsities.

III. The first thing of redemption performed by the Lord was the separation of the evil from the good, and the elevation of the good to Himself into heaven, and the removal of the evil from Himself into hell; for thus the good are liberated from the evil.

IV. The second thing of redemption was the arrangement into order of all things in the heavens, and the subordination of all things in the hells.

V. The third thing of redemption was the revelation of truths from the new heaven and thence the resuscitation and establishment of a new church on the earth by which the good are still further separated and liberated from the evil. (*Ibid.*, n. 21.)

From these statements it is evident that the revelation of Divine truth is the means by which a church is established on the earth. This revelation is made by the Lord alone. It is a part and an essential part of the work of redemption. The truth thus revealed is given for the instruction of the people. When the truth is perceived the church comes into light. As it receives the revealed truth it is in its light and morning, and through instruction progresses toward its noonday.

What part does human reason have in the original giving of this revelation, and in the formulation of its truths? The teaching of the higher critics and most of the theologians at the present

day is that all the doctrines of the church have been developed by the growing intelligence of man. It is said that the untutored savage first formed the idea of God. When he saw the mighty forces of nature he imagined that a great being was manifesting his power. In storm and tempest, in thunder and lightning, God or the gods were manifesting their power. As men rose in intelligence the first crude ideas and worship were refined and improved, so that in process of time all the doctrines and rites of the church were evolved by the operation of the imagination, the reason and the feelings of men. If this is the mode by which doctrine and religion have been developed, it is evident that their very beginnings spring from a false premise. Every successive step is the evolution of an error. Increasing intelligence rejected the cruder notions but retained the central thought and adapted it to the higher degree of intelligence. It should be evident that if the idea of God was the result of a false deduction in the beginning, it will be finally rejected when the reason rectifies its own errors. Reason if unguided and unenlightened by revelation will not only reject the idea of revelation, but will also reject all things that have come into the world by means of revelation.

The knowledge of spiritual things did not come into the world originally by the use of imagination and reason. This knowledge was originally given by revelation, as we learn from the following: —

The knowledge of God, and thence an acknowledgment of Him, are not attainable without revelation; and a knowledge of the Lord and thence an acknowledgment, that in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, are not attainable except from the Word, which is the crown of revelations; for man, by the revelation which is given, is able to approach God, and to receive influx, and so from natural to become spiritual. The first revelation pervaded all the world, and the natural man had perverted it in many ways; whence arose the disputes, dissensions, heresies and schisms of religions. (*True Christian Religion*, n. 11.)

From this we see the fundamental error of those who apply the doctrine of evolution to religion, and who imagine that the doc-

trines of the church originally came into the world through the natural exercise of the imagination and reason. That the reason itself was not consulted in the original giving of revelation may appear from the internal sense of the story of Abraham and Abimelech as given in the twentieth chapter of Genesis. The function of reason in its relation to revelation is there described. In the exposition of the internal sense we read:—

Doctrine is said to look to what is rational, when nothing is acknowledged as truth of doctrine but what can be comprehended by the reason; so that the consideration of all the things which are of doctrine is from the rational. Yet that the doctrine of faith is not from a rational but from a celestial origin, is taught in the internal sense in what follows. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 2510.)

The things contained in this verse involve the Lord's first thought respecting the doctrine of faith; whether it would be well to consult the rational, or not. The first thought was such, because the Lord progressed according to all Divine order; and whatever was of the human into which He was born, and which He derived from the mother, must necessarily be put off, that He might put on the Divine; thus also this human thought, namely, whether the rational was to be consulted in doctrinals of faith. (*Ibid.*, n. 2511.)

If the rational were consulted in the giving of the Word and doctrine, they would not fulfil the purpose of making man spiritual, as we may see from what is further said in the series:—

By Abimelech's dying because of the woman is signified that the doctrine of faith would become nought, if the rational were consulted. That there is no doctrine of faith from the rational, is because the rational is in appearances of good and truth, which appearances are not in themselves truths (as was shown before, n. 2053, 2196, 2203, 2209). Besides, the rational has fallacies under it, which are from external sensual things confirmed by what is learned, which produce obscurity in those appearances of truth. The rational for the most part is merely human, as may also be evident from its origin. Hence then it is, that from it no doctrinal of faith can have a beginning, and still less can it be constructed from it; but it must be from the Divine Itself and the Divine Human of the Lord. Thence is its origin, and indeed so entirely that the Lord is doctrine itself; on which account also in the Word He is called the Word, the Truth, the Light, the Way, the Door; and, what is an arcanum, every doctrinal is from the Divine good and the Divine truth, and has in itself the heavenly marriage. A doc-

trinal which has not this in it, is not a genuine doctrinal of faith. Hence it is, that in all the particulars of the Word, whence doctrine is, there is something of marriage (see n. 683, 793, 801). The doctrine of faith appears indeed, in the literal or outer sense of the Word, as if it had many things from the rational, and even from the natural; but this is because the Word is for man, and has been thus accommodated to him; but still in itself it is spiritual from a celestial origin, that is, from Divine truth conjoined to Divine good. That doctrine would become nought, if as to its contents the rational were consulted, will be illustrated by examples in what follows. (*Ibid.*, n. 2516.)

The reason that the rational was not consulted in any manner, is . . . that the doctrinals of faith are all from the Divine, which is infinitely above the human rational. From the Divine the rational takes its good and its truth. The Divine can enter into the rational, but not the rational into the Divine; as the soul can enter into the body, and form it, but not the body into the soul; or as light can enter into shade, and modify it variously into colors, but not shade into light. But as it appears at first as if the rational ought to be present, because the rational itself is what receives, at first the thought here was, whether it should not at the same time be consulted. But the Lord revealed and answered to Himself, that the doctrine would thus become nought; wherefore the rational was not consulted; which is here signified by Abimelech's not coming near her. (*Ibid.*, n. 2519.)

The Lord's natural rational was formed at first as is the rational of every man. It was not at first Divine. His merely natural rational partaking of human infirmities had no part in the making of doctrine; but doctrine was so formed that it is accommodated to the states of the rational faculty. This is illustrated by many examples. For instance if this rational faculty were consulted in regard to the formation of the Word and doctrine it would from merely natural light deny them, as that:—

The Divine Itself can be in nothing but the Divine, thus in nothing but the Lord's Divine Human and through this with man. If the rational were consulted, it would say that the Divine Itself can be in the human of everyone. (*Ibid.*, n. 2520.)

In like manner the rational merely human would reject the idea that man does not live, nor do good nor believe truth from

himself, but these are from the Lord, so in a thousand other things. If the natural rational of the Lord was such, still more so is the rational of every man. At the present day it is most common for men to criticise and reject the letter of the Word as Divine because its literal form seems to teach things untrue. They reject it because of its claim to being a revelation. In like manner the teachings of Swedenborg are viewed with incredulity because of his claim that he was intromitted into the spiritual world. If the rational were consulted all such claims would be eliminated from the teachings of Swedenborg. The very doctrine concerning the spiritual world and especially the memorable relations would be excised. The rational would do this because to it these things in Swedenborg's writings do not seem to be in agreement with sound reason.

The Word however and doctrine are given from a higher wisdom and express this higher wisdom in forms accommodated to the rational and natural minds. But in this accommodation the formation and the formulation are effected by the higher clothing itself with the lower, even as the soul clothes itself with matter that it may have a body extant in the world. In every minute part of the expressed form of revealed truth there is the Divine wisdom within. If the rational itself had determined this form it would have been constructed entirely from natural light and natural ends, thereby excluding the Divine from its proper expression.

The series of the internal sense of this chapter (GEN. xx) concerning Abraham and Abimelech show that both the subject matter and the form of the Word and doctrine are given by revelation from the Divine Itself. Its subject matter is not at all determined by the rational. Even the form of the revelation is affected by the rational and the natural only by the fact that the spiritual ideas must take from the natural the means, namely, the words and facts, by which the spiritual thought may be clothed in suitable and corresponding forms.

It is of the greatest importance for us to see clearly that the Word and doctrine are revealed by the Lord from or through

heaven, they are brought down to earth and clothed in corresponding and suitable forms to express Divine and spiritual things to men. When thus revealed the revelation is the Lord's. It is not the wisdom of the man through whom it is revealed. The function of revelation in the church is to bring down from heaven the life and light thereof and embody them in forms adapted to reception by men, the natural sense in accommodation to natural men, the spiritual sense in accommodation to the opening and developing rational minds of men that they may become spiritual.

This function of revelation in the church may seem to exclude reason from any part in the consideration and reception of spiritual truth. Such a view has been wide-spread in the past. The doctrines of the New Church, however, give a most important place to the rational faculty in the work of establishing the church. Although the rational faculty of itself cannot make doctrine, still when it is revealed it can consider and examine it, support and confirm, and present it in a rational manner to others, or deny it. When doctrine and the Word come within the field of the rational mind, there are just two positions which the rational can take toward revealed truth, namely, the negative or the affirmative. The affirmative principle we are taught leads to all wisdom, and the negative principle leads to all folly and insanity. What is revealed is the Lord's wisdom, the Divine truth. Facts are revealed concerning the spiritual world; truths are revealed concerning the Lord; the laws of heavenly life are revealed. The only thing that men can do with a revelation is either to affirm or deny it. They cannot annihilate it. They can misinterpret and pervert its meaning; but the revelation remains as the very centre of human intellectual life. The history of the Christian Church shows that in every intellectual state the Word has been and is the very centre of intellectual life, be it affirmative or negative. Of these two principles we read:—

There are two principles, therefore; one which leads to all folly and insanity, and another which leads to all intelligence and wisdom. The

former principle is to deny all things, or to say in one's heart that he cannot believe them before he is convinced by things which he can apprehend, or perceive by the senses: this is the principle that leads to all folly and insanity, and it is to be called the negative principle. The other principle is to affirm the things which are of doctrine from the Word, or to think and believe in one's self that they are true because the Lord has said them: this is the principle which leads to all intelligence and wisdom, and is to be called the affirmative principle. They who think from the negative principle, the more they consult what is rational, of external knowledge, and of philosophy, the more do they cast and precipitate themselves into darkness, till at length they deny all things. The causes are, that no one can apprehend higher things from lower ones, that is, spiritual and celestial things, still less Divine, from lower ones, because they transcend all understanding, and moreover everything is then involved in negatives from the [negative] principle. But, on the contrary, they who think from an affirmative principle can confirm themselves by whatever things of reason, of outward knowledge, indeed of philosophy, they have at command; for all these are confirming things to them, and give them a fuller idea of the matter. Moreover, some are in doubt before they deny, and some are in doubt before they affirm. Those who are in doubt before they deny, are they who incline to a life of evil; and when this life carries them away, then so far as they think of those things, they deny them. But those who are in doubt before they affirm, are they who incline to a life of good; and when they suffer themselves to be bended to this by the Lord, then so far as they think of those things at the time, so far they affirm. As these things are further treated of in the verses which follow, it is permitted by the Divine mercy of the Lord to illustrate them more fully there (see n. 2588). (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 2568.)

The Lord when in the world meditated on the right methods of instructing men in spiritual things as we may see from the following: —

The doctrine of faith, as the Lord thought concerning it in His boyhood, is here treated of, that is to say, whether it were allowable to enter into it by rational things, and so to form to one's self ideas concerning it. His thinking of this was from the love of providing for mankind, who are such as not to believe what they do not comprehend in a rational manner. But He perceived from the Divine that this ought not to be done; on which account He revealed the doctrine to Himself from the Divine, and from that at the same time all things in the universe that are subordinate to it, namely, those belonging to the rational mind, and those belonging to the natural. How it is with the doctrinals of faith among men has been said above (n. 2568), namely, that there are two principles from which they think, a

negative and an affirmative; and that those think from the negative principle, who believe nothing unless they are convinced by what is of reason and outward knowledge, and indeed of sense; but those from the affirmative, who believe that things are true because the Lord has said them in the Word, and thus who have faith in the Lord. Those who are in the negative in regard to a thing being true because it is in the Word, say in heart that they will believe when they are persuaded by reason and outward knowledge. But the fact is that they never believe; and indeed they would not believe if they were to be convinced by their bodily senses, by sight, hearing, and touch; for they would always be forming new reasonings against the things, and thus end by altogether extinguishing all faith, and at the same time turning the light of the rational into darkness, because into falsities. But those who are in the affirmative, that is, who believe that things are true because the Lord has said so, are continually being confirmed, and their ideas enlightened and strengthened, by what is of reason and outward knowledge and even by what is of sense; for *man has light from no other source than through reason and knowledge, and such is the way with every one*. With these the doctrine thus "living lives"; and of them it is said, that they are healed and bring forth. But with those who are in the negative the doctrine "dying dies"; and of them it is said that "the womb closing is closed." It is manifest from this, what it is to enter into the doctrine of faith by rational things, and what to enter into rational things by the doctrine of faith.* (*Ibid.*, n. 2588).

From what has now been said it may be seen that the function of revelation is to bring down from heaven to earth the knowledge of spiritual and Divine things, that man may be elevated from the natural to the spiritual, and may thereby as it were, ascend the steps of Jacob's ladder to perceive and acknowledge the Divine. This giving of revelation is purely a Divine work in which human reason has no part. Reason can neither create nor discover and thence cannot formulate the truths relating to God, to the Lord, and to the spiritual world. It can only examine these truths when they are revealed and reason about them. Nevertheless the human intellect including the reason or rational faculty has an important part in the reception, propagation, and use of the principles of revelation. This was represented in the Most Ancient Church by the river in Eden which was parted into four heads:—

* Italics inserted by the writer.

The river out of Eden signifies wisdom from love. . . . To be parted into four heads, is a representative of intelligence. (*Ibid.*, n. 107.)

The first river signifies the intelligence of faith from love. (*Ibid.*, n. 110.)

The second river, signifies the knowledges of all things which are of good and truth. (*Ibid.*, n. 116.)

The third river is reason, or the clear seeing of reason. . . . The fourth river is knowledge. (*Ibid.*, n. 118.)

From these rivers it may be evident what celestial order is, or how things of life proceed — namely, from the Lord, Who is the East. From Him is wisdom, through wisdom intelligence, through intelligence reason; and so through reason the knowledges which are of the memory are vivified. This is the order of life. (*Ibid.*, n. 121.)

From these passages we may see that the human intellectual faculties are by no means excluded from the consideration of heavenly and Divine things. They are illuminated by the Lord that men may see and acknowledge the truth. In the Most Ancient Church reason had its place and a most important place in the church, but when reason was used in wrong ways, namely, to reason against revelation, it was condemned.

Reasonings from things of sense concerning the arcana of faith the Most Ancient people called the poison of the serpent; and the reasoners themselves they called serpents. (*Ibid.*, n. 195.)

Such reasonings lead to the denial of things revealed. In fact the decline and fall of every church has been caused by evils of life and by a negative attitude toward the truth revealed for the instruction and guidance of that church.

In the New Church the intellectual faculty, including the rational, has a most important function. In a relation picturing the New Church represented by a temple seen in the spiritual world, we read: —

Afterward, when I drew nearer, I saw this writing above the gate, NUNC LICET (*Now it is lawful*), which signified that it is now lawful to enter intellectually into the arcana of faith. From seeing this writing, it came into my thought that it is exceedingly dangerous to enter with the understanding into dogmas of faith composed from one's own intelligence and thus from falsities, and still more to confirm them from the Word; the understanding is thereby closed above, and gradually below also, to such

an extent that theological matters not only cause disgust, but they are also obliterated as writing on paper by worms, and the wool of a piece of cloth by moths; the understanding abiding only in political matters which regard a man's life in the dominion where he is, in the civil matters pertaining to his employment, and the domestic affairs belonging to his own house. And in all these things he constantly kisses nature, and owing to the allurements of her pleasures he loves her as an idolater loves the golden image in his bosom. Now as the dogmas of the Christian churches of the present day have not been composed from the Word, but from men's own intelligence and thus from falsities, and as they have also been confirmed by some things from the Word, by the Lord's Divine Providence the Word has been taken from the laity among the Roman Catholics, and among the Protestants has been opened but still has been closed by their common declaration that the understanding is to be kept under obedience to their faith. But in the New Church the contrary is the case; in this church it is allowable to enter with the understanding and to penetrate into all its secrets, and also to confirm them by the Word. This is because its doctrinals are continuous truths, laid open by the Lord by means of the Word; and confirmations of those truths by means of what is rational cause the understanding to be opened above more and more, and thus to be elevated into the light in which the angels of heaven are; and that light in its essence is truth, and in this light the acknowledgment of the Lord as the God of heaven and earth shines in its glory. This is meant by the writing over the door of the temple, *NUNC LICET*; and also by the veil of the shrine before the cherub being lifted. For it is a Canon of the New Church that falsities close the understanding, and that truths open it. (*True Christian Religion*, n. 508.)

In order that we may gain a clear idea of the function and place of reason in the church, it is necessary for us to know that there are two forms of the rational mind. One is represented by Ishmael, the Son of Abram, born of Hagar the Egyptian. The other rational is represented by Isaac the son of Abraham and Sarah. Ishmael represents the first rational the quality of which was represented by his being called a wild-ass man, his hand against every man and every man's hand against him. He was expelled from the house because he mocked when Isaac was weaned. It is this first rational which is inclined to take the negative attitude toward revealed spiritual truth. The second rational sees this spiritual truth, affirms, confirms, and defends it by means of rational and natural things. The first

rational itself is formed by means of the external senses and knowledge acquired by means of the senses. This is the rational as formed by the natural sciences alone. It is the form of the rational so largely developed at the present day, which is negative toward the Word and to all revealed truth. The spiritual rational must be formed, cultivated and developed to succeed this. This rational can be born and developed only by means of the Word and the rational and spiritual truths now revealed out of the Word for the New Church. It is the high function and use of those who have received these truths to so present them to the world that a new perception and acknowledgment of the truth of the Word shall be developed, by which the truths concerning the Lord, the spiritual world and spiritual things in general may be seen in clear light and be fully confirmed by the genuine principles of reason and science.

There are many indications that the discussion of spiritual things is coming to the front in public attention. The New Church has a most important place in this discussion. It must bring the principles of the Heavenly Doctrines to bear on every topic. The revealed truth of the Word and of Doctrine must be presented in clear light, that the Lord Jesus Christ may be seen as the only God of heaven and earth, and that every truth may be seen to be in the most perfect harmony with enlightened reason and science. This work can be done by the New Church only so far as the truths revealed to it are seen rationally, and are not accepted merely in the old way of believing them blindly without a rational perception and acknowledgment of their truth. In order to coöperate with the Lord in this work of developing the spiritual rational in men, we must ourselves first of all experience the birth of Isaac in ourselves. To perform this use, which is the great work of the coming century, we must prepare ourselves by gaining more rational views of our own doctrines, and a clearer intellectual comprehension of the questions of the age.

Swedenborg was once asked in the spiritual world why from a philosopher he became a theologian. He replied, For the same

reason that fishermen became disciples and apostles of the Lord; for he said, From my early youth I have been a spiritual fisherman, — that is, one who investigates and teaches natural truths and afterward spiritual truths in a rational manner (*Influx*, n. 20). The advocate of the doctrines of the New Church in the coming century must be in the truest sense a spiritual fisherman.

Revelation is the mode by which the principles of Divine Truth are given by the Lord from heaven. Reason examines that truth and tests its consistency with itself, and its harmony with nature and human experience. If the truth is accepted, reason has the further function of adapting the truth to the ever-varying conditions of men, and of applying the truth to the life. All divine truth revealed by the Lord is given for the purpose of making man spiritual, and this involves a complete revolution not only in all things of the life of the individual, but it will eventually change the quality of the social and national life. In this work of applying revealed principles to life the reason takes the leading part. It examines wrong and evil principles and evils which obstruct; it shows how better things will result by the application of the truth to life; it convinces others by rational processes and leads in many ways to the establishment of the kingdom of heaven on earth. Reason is the instrument by which revelation is brought down into the practical life of humanity, and by which the purpose of revelation is accomplished, namely, the making of man into the image and likeness of God.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

A STUDY IN LITURGICS.

A "LITURGY" for the General Church of the New Jerusalem, was published at Bryn Athyn, Pa., in 1908, with no signature of authorship or endorsement; but it is understood to be the work chiefly of Bishop Pendleton and the Rev. Mr. Caldwell of Chicago, with the assistance of other ministers.* As the result of many years of patient and careful labor the work is received with much apparent satisfaction by the societies of the "General Church" and is being introduced into use as rapidly as the somewhat elaborate and unusual nature of the services will permit. The book is a small quarto-shaped volume of no less than 814 pages, but in thickness is only about half that of the "Book of Worship" of the General Convention. This extraordinary capacity for a thin book is made possible by the use of the thinnest of modern Bible paper, hardly heavier than a very light tissue paper, and while of excellent quality as to opaqueness, somewhat difficult to handle in turning the leaves. The type is about the same as that of the Convention's tentative "Rites and Prayers," and the whole appearance is of marked neatness and good taste.

This new "Liturgy" has been received with expressions of the most cordial and even enthusiastic approval by not only the societies of the "General Church," but especially by members of the Convention and of the English Conference. In the *Messenger* advertisement of the book, a Convention minister says, "he does not see how it could be improved upon; complete, wonderfully rich in material, get-at-able; a mine of doctrinal truths, a splendid aid to worship, etc." The *Morning Light* (London) calls it:—

* While this book received editorial notice in the REVIEW, Vol. XVI, p. 308, we place this critical examination of it before our readers because it involves a study of the whole subject of Liturgics and is of exceptional interest and value at this time. — EDITORS.

a monument of industry and devotion, . . . unquestionably a work of art in the best sense and a model in many respects of what such a work should be. . . . The prayers are beautifully worded and in the services every approach to tediousness has been studiously avoided. . . . The congregation is kept busy throughout.

More eloquent still in praise of the book is the Rev. Arthur E. Beilby in a seven-page review of it in the January number of the *New-Church Magazine*, the Conference's monthly, the article being headed, "A Twentieth Century Missal." The reviewer calls it:—

a full discrete degree ahead of our Conference "Liturgy" and of every other compilation that has ever fallen into my hands. It is as a light carriage with C springs compared to a lumbering wain. It is unique. It is more than a monument of industry. . . . It is a *product*. It is the last result of complexity and the highest form of art.

The prayers — of which there are no less than 207 apart from those in the services — appeal to Mr. Beilby in their "brevity and unadorned directness." "Enough," he says at the close, after a few slight criticisms; "more faults, I dare say, might be found; but the new Liturgy calls for an anthem of praise and the top note must and shall be gratitude, though it drown every other sound."

American New-Churchmen who know the ponderous verbosity and didactic coldness of the English Conference "Liturgy," will be able to allow for the enthusiasm with which our English brethren generally greet any outlook for a change into something else, even though Conference itself remains stationary in adhering to the old book; and the historical equipment of Mr. Beilby as a liturgical critic may be judged of by his commenting on some of the hymns as "quite new" to him, and "charming as they are novel"; among these being the hymn, "Fierce was the wild billow," familiar to us for sixteen years as no. 343, in our "Magnificat," — a hymn to be found in nearly all English Hymnals, and translated by Neale from the ancient Greek hymn of Anatolius of the VIIIth Century.

But with all this mead of high praise which we are glad to

quote to the readers of the REVIEW, we think that our friends who have sent us the new "Liturgy" for review will appreciate quite as much a sincere effort to pass a just criticism, from the technical liturgical standpoint, upon a work embodying so much careful and conscientious labor and aspiring to so important a use as does the work before us. As an essentially new contribution in many respects to New-Church liturgics, it offers profitable material not only for use in a devotional way but for comparative study.

And first as to the title and terminology of the book, especially seeing that the body issuing it is generally understood to be opposed to all that savors of the old or past Christian dispensation as to that which is utterly false and dead. We find on the contrary a broad and catholic liberality pervading the work throughout not only in the make-up of its contents but in the retention of the old liturgical terms for which the modern substitutes have proved but poor makeshifts. The title "The Liturgy," is retained from the General Convention's book in use before the division, and is undoubtedly a truer name than the term "Book of Worship" adopted later by the Convention. For "liturgy," from the Greek *leitourgia*, a service or task to be performed, was applied anciently to the Holy Supper recalling the supreme command, "This *do*, in remembrance of me." It stands for those ultimate "acts of worship" which the book contains; while no book can presume to contain the "worship" itself, since, this can rest only in the spirit of the worshipper whether in his acts of worship or in the conduct of life.

The divisions of the work are:—

I. *General Offices*, or services, twelve in number, divided into "Offices of Humiliation" and "Offices of Glorification."

II. "*Antiphons*," twenty in number, corresponding in a manner to our "Responsive Services"; the meaning of the Greek *anti-phone* being the sounding or answering back and forth.

III. *The Psalter*, sixty-three selections from the Psalms;

but containing also, under the same title, twelve selections from the Prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah.

IV. *The Law*, containing the Decalogue in various forms, entire and abridged; and nine exhortations and a collection of short passages exhorting to obedience, chiefly from Deuteronomy.

V. *The Gospel*, containing fifty-seven short passages from the Gospels and Revelation.

VI. *The Doctrine*, embracing fourteen "General Confessions of Faith," or Creeds, to be read at option in concert or by the minister alone; and, under the head of "General Doctrine," twenty-two summary passages from the writings of Swedenborg, treating quite fully of subjects somewhat in the order of the "New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrines." These dwell especially on the subjects of the "Advent of the Lord," "Eternal Life," "Creation," "Providence," and "The Sacraments." A notable omission, is that of any passage from "Conjugal Love" or other work relating to marriage. These summaries are generally a free phrasing of the exact language of the writings of Swedenborg and are entirely without reference to their source, although the extracts from the Word are always followed by such references. The second of these passages of "General Doctrine," under the head of "Evangelization," begins thus: — "This is the gospel which the Lord commanded to be preached to the whole world: 'That Jehovah God Himself came into the world to deliver man,' " etc. These words which are from "Canons," Redemption VI, 6, are of so mandatory a form that it would seem better that a reference to their doctrinal source should accompany them. As these passages of doctrine are also assigned to be read at option by the minister after the "Third Lesson," alternating with passages from the "Law and Gospel," it would seem that their distinct source should be named there as well as where passages are read directly from the "Doctrines," as the "Third Lesson," when the rubric requires that the minister shall say: — "The Word of the Lord in the Heavenly Doctrine as it is written in such a book, such a

number." The matter of introducing the reading of the writings of Swedenborg as a "Third Lesson" "from the Word of the Lord" we mention for information only; it is too large a subject to be discussed here incidentally.

VII. *Prayers*, containing no less than two hundred and seven short collects or more lengthy prayers, entirely without titles or classification of any sort as to season, occasion, or subject. As the rubric requires that the people alone shall utter the "Amen" at the end of the prayers, and as there is no uniformity in their concluding phrases, it would seem quite impossible for the people to know where to find and follow the prayer and so to know of its termination. Upon the subject of marriage again, it is to be noted that out of the large collection of prayers but a single one is assigned to this subject, and that one treats of marriage only in the general sense, the conjunction of the Church with the Lord.

VIII. *Sacraments and Rites*, including besides "Baptism," the "Holy Supper," "Marriage," "Ordination," and "Burial"; also the "Rite of Confession of Faith or Confirmation," and the "Rite of Betrothal." In this last the instruction is given from the "Doctrine" that the use of the rite is that "the souls of the two may incline towards each other and that conjugal love may grow up in just order from its spiritual origin."

The *Ordination* rite is a form of general introduction to the priesthood, followed by distinct formulas for the conferring of the several degrees or orders, namely, that of minister, pastor, and bishop. Each order or grade has its distinct use clearly designated; the first being that of teaching and baptizing; the second that of officiating at marriage and the Holy Supper, in addition to the first; and the third being that of "ordaining and of presiding over a general body of the Church." While the title of minister belongs to the first grade only, it is used alone in all the offices including marriage and the Holy Supper which are distinctively pastoral offices. The rite of burial is similar generally to that of the "Book of Worship," but with fuller selection of doctrinal passages, and these admirably chosen.

In the *Sacrament of Baptism* a confession of faith in the Lord is required of those bringing infants to be baptized; and the formula of baptism varies from the letter of the Gospel in that the minister says, "I baptize thee *in* the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, Father, Son and Holy Spirit." This is also a departure from the form "into the name" as heretofore used in the Academy "Liturgy" and in the Convention "Liturgy" since 1829, the latter having quite a different meaning from "in the name." "Into the name" is unquestionably the form of the original Greek; it was used in the early Church, and is recognized now in the Revised Version. In the Epistles "*in* the name of the Lord Jesus" is frequently used in the sense of "by authority of" or "after the will of," but "*into* the name," whether in MATT. xxviii, or ACTS xix, 5, means an admission or insertion into a new quality or nature, which the Christian baptism distinctly is. The adoption therefore of the form "In the name" is a relinquishment of the profounder meaning of the Sacrament as resting in the letter of the Word, and adopting the less significant meaning of the modern ritual of popular usage.

The change in the Divine formula given in the Word to baptize "into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit," by inserting before these titles "the Lord Jesus Christ" is another topic too large for discussion here.

The *Holy Supper* is preceded by a penitential service embracing the Decalogue and responsive prayers; but there is no mention here or provision for the offertory, or that distinct act of thanksgiving which was the central feature of the early Christian rite and gave it its beautiful name of the "Eucharist," the "giving of thanks for the redemption of the world." This act forms a conspicuous part of the Communion Office in all the Christian Liturgies that have come down from early times, being designated by the "Sursum corda," the Greek *Anaphora* or "Lift up your hearts," and responses. This was followed, as in the Convention's "Rites and Sacraments," p. 45, with the "Special Thanksgiving" beginning:—

We praise Thee, we give Thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, our Creator, Redeemer and Savior, Jesus Christ, and [after the special thanksgiving] with all the angels of heaven we adore Thee and lift up our hearts, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, etc.

The omission of these special and distinct "acts of remembrance" is the more regrettable since it seems to fall in with the habit of regarding no more the Lord's Supper as an act done literally "in remembrance of Him," but as something quite subjective and abstract which is difficult for the ordinary mind to lay hold on.

We are tempted to dwell for a moment on the subject of the "*Anaphora*" or "Offertory," not only because of its very interesting historical and prophetic meaning as a part of the early Christian liturgy, but because there is in it what might be made of so much spiritual power in the worship of the New Church at the present day. The form as furnished in the Convention's "Rites and Sacraments" is ample for this purpose, being in a form of general thanksgiving for redemption, and also providing for the special thanksgiving demanded by special occasions or sacred commemorations. The communion in this way becomes a more powerful, as it is a more ultimate, mental "act of remembrance." In what is known among the very early Christian liturgies as the "Liturgy of St. James," or the Jerusalem liturgy, ascribed to Clement, the priest after presenting the people's offerings or the "Holy Gifts" says, "O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his Name together"; and later, "Lift we up minds and hearts!" — whence the term, Greek, *anaphora*, or Latin, *sursum corda*! After this the "Holy, holy," and the "Hosanna; Blessed is he who cometh in the Name of the Lord" is sung; and then follows the reading of the Lord's instituting the supper on the night of His betrayal, with the injunction of perpetual remembrance. What is of prophetic significance is, that as our Lord before His passion, as if foreseeing the falling away of the church from its faith in Him, wept over Jerusalem, the "house left desolate," and said "ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say 'Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of

the Lord,'” so this greeting of the Lord in His divine Name, which was made a prominent note in the *anaphora* of the early liturgies, disappears in the reformed, Anglican Church. The sacrament is declared “to set forth the Lord’s death till He come”; and the greeting “Blessed is He who comes,” with its joyous “Hosanna,” is left out of the *anaphora*, and in the puritan or reformed services of the Communion is entirely absent. There seems to be a worthy and deep reason why in the New Church we should restore this beautiful form of adoration in our rite for that “holiest act of worship” in which the Church above all keeps the feast of remembrance and of the Lord’s presence as the Redeemer of mankind. The New-Church pastor who, aided by an intelligent choir can with reverent feeling enter into this ancient form of the “Lifting up” by the use of the responsive offertory and thanksgiving as furnished in the Convention’s “Rites and Sacraments,” p. 41-44, will help the Church in taking a real step upward in a spiritual recognition and use of the Holy Supper, as well as add a joyous note to what has been allowed perhaps to retain too much of a kind of funereal solemnity as setting forth our Lord’s death rather than His life, and His absence rather than His presence.

The Antiphon, or responsive service, introducing the Communion, in the “Liturgy” now under review, is indeed one of joyful thankful spirit, but if it were associated, as in the early rite, with the actual “bringing of offerings” as an ultimate, it would be much more powerful in its influence.

Another feature we would have gladly seen in a service which has so much to be commended, is the ante-communion prayer “for the whole Church,” in which the worshippers unite in loving remembrance of all, absent or present, here and above, the youth, the afflicted and tempted, and those in all estates and conditions, — as if gathering in one great family about the table of the One merciful and loving Father of all. It is a feature handed down from the earliest rites of the Christian Church and seems to express as an ultimate, more than any other act, that great primary doctrine of the purpose of the Holy

Supper that "the Church may be conjoined thereby with the Lord and with heaven" (Heavenly Doctrine, n. 210), and that, as "in the feast of charity in the Primitive Christian Church, they were conjoined together in gladness of heart and strengthened one another to abide in the worship of the Lord from a sincere heart" (True Christian Religion, nn. 423, 727). Such a "Prayer of Brotherhood" or of the whole family of the Lord's church has been provided for many years in the Psalter Edition of the Convention's "Book of Worship"; and in the new "Rites and Prayers" it is inserted in its proper place in the Ante-Communion service.

There is much, however, in the "Office of the Holy Supper" in the new "Liturgy" that is both of the nature of thanksgiving, of remembrance, of joyful confession, and that reminds the liturgical student strongly of the liturgies of the early Christian Church — that for instance of Chrysostom, in the frank and joyous adoration of the Lord in His Divine Humanity as the Redeemer of the world. Especially noteworthy is the confession uttered together by the minister and people on their knees at the close of the prayer of consecration: —

O Lord, Immanuel, God with us, our Savior and Redeemer Jesus Christ; Thou art our Father in the heavens; Thou art the Son of God that came into the world, etc.

It seems strange that in the Communion service itself the Lord's Prayer is not inserted; also that the minister's own communing is quite apart from the communing of the people, being deferred until after the grace pronounced upon those who have partaken.

In general the language of the rites and of the prayers throughout is characterized by a chaste beauty and dignity most worthy of commendation, especially in the sacraments and in the rites of marriage and of ordination. As examples taken at random from the collection of prayers we will quote these two: —

O Lord Jesus Christ, who in Thine own Divine Person didst fulfill the law and the prophets; we beseech Thee to grant unto us the power to keep

Thy commandments, that all self-love, all hatred and revenge and every evil desire may be removed from our hearts, and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; that in humility and with forgiveness for all men we may receive from Thee our daily bread and ascribe unto Thee all power and glory forever. Amen.

Almighty God, our Father in heaven, who by Thine incarnation, and by Thy Glorified Human, hast made a new creation for Thyself: preserve, we pray Thee, the work of Thy mercy; cleanse Thou Thy Church from the stain of sin, free her from the bondage of death, that by Divine Power Thine everlasting kingdom may be builded in the hearts of men and the church on earth be made one with the church in heaven, to dwell as one before Thee forever. Amen.

It is to be noticed that these two prayers are in the strict "Collect" form, being introduced each by a commemoration of some act or attribute of the Lord upon which the petition is based. Placed in a proper historical order they would constitute a series adapted to the Christian Year like the antiphons, collects, and Gospels of the new tentative "Rites and Prayers" of the Convention. The rubric of the new "Liturgy" makes provision for such a successive or historic use of the antiphons, or responsive services, covering the series of feasts from the Nativity to the Glorification, Ascension and the Holy Spirit and Second Coming. It does not identify these subjects, however, with the days of the Church's Calendar, but leaves them in their abstract purport, in a series embracing such titles as Evangelization, Faith, Conjunction with the Human Race, Unity of God, Creation, Love, Charity, and Works, etc., — thus building the devotional worship of the Church, as it were, upon a strictly doctrinal or intellectual scaffold, like a study of the "True Christian Religion" in the order of its chapters, rather than in following the dramatic and personal representation of redemption as given in the life of our Lord in the Word and as rendered objective in the Christian Year. The twenty-two "Antiphons" with their duly associated hymns, lessons and prayers, bear an interesting resemblance to that series of brief "Scripture Lessons," each having its appointed selection or anthem to follow, which was given in the earliest "Book of Public

Worship for the use of the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem" in the year 1829. Both are weak and inefficient in their want of the human form upon which the objective or historic worship from the Word is constructed and which forms the basis of the Church's Calendar.

As a principle of liturgics it is to be noticed that every feast and every ultimate act of worship ordained in the Word is distinctly associated with some visible, tangible, personal act. We are commanded to worship the Lord our God "because He has brought us out of Egypt, the house of bondage." We are to remember and keep holy the Sabbath because the Lord rested on the seventh day after His work. We are to keep the sacraments because the Lord commanded us to "do this in remembrance of Him." We are to love one another "because the Lord has loved us." We are "to take up our cross and follow" the Lord, because, "thus it behooved Christ to suffer"; even the spiritual and eternal life is dependent on the Divine Person who said, "Because I live, ye shall live also." It is upon this basis of personal and objective regard that the Christian Year's observance rests its claim to a peculiar spiritual power in "preserving what is Divine among the people." The analytic apportionment of our worship according to an intellectual and logical order of abstract theological themes may present a kind of theoretic order suitable to a psychological or theological *seminar*, but it does not accord with human experience, either as regards the successive religious states of the individual, or the combined states of the congregation. Whereas the same theological themes clothed with the successive dramatic scenes of our Lord's life and teaching appeal sensibly and therefore powerfully to the common states of all alike, as does the letter of the Word itself, written in this dramatic manner for this very purpose.

Besides the term "Antiphons" substituted in place of "Responsive Services," the new book uses the title "Offices" for "Services," following again more closely the ancient ritual terminology. The choice of this or that term is not of great importance, — liturgy, office, and service all meaning an act

performed, or to be performed, the term rite and ritual meaning, rather, the way in which the act is performed. But having adopted the term "Offices" there is no apparent reason why one of these should be termed a "Short Service" (p. 83). The "General Offices" or services are of great length and complexity as compared with any we have had before. They follow in general the accustomed order of penitential approach, the prayer, sanctus, psalter, and lessons, which last are three in number — also there are antiphons, creed or confession, prayer, reading of the Decalogue, the Law, the Gospel, the Doctrines, further prayers, with hymns and Psalms introduced frequently, besides an interlude "followed by a period of silence"; sermon with its introductory invocation and its closing ascription; hymns, offertory, closing prayers and benediction, and a closing doxology sung while the minister closes the Word and retires. An "Introit" is appointed to be sung before the beginning of the service (although there are no selections or hymns set apart under this title). The word means of course an "introduction" derived probably from the "introibo" of the Communion Psalm, "I will go unto the altar of God."

The music is inserted in place for the sanctus, the antiphons and allelulias, besides the provision of a wide additional choice from the collection of chants and hymns. We are struck with the painfully high pitch of many of the congregational chants, even of those of a subdued penitential character to be sung while kneeling. As, for example, in the opening petitions of the first General Office, the music is generally of an elaborate character, as unlike as possible the "plain chant" of the simple Gregorian tones which has been the "music of the people" for centuries, and so intricate as to require choirs of some skill to render it. It is not unusual to find the air running up to G and A, and in one of the anthems there is a sustained note on the upper B flat.

The hymns number 165, including many set as solo songs or in the form of anthems; and the selections with chants number 102, and there are, in addition, 10 anthems and music for the *Te Dominum*, the sanctus (the words being those of the "Breviary") and six settings of the "Amen" of the Parsifal —

known as the "Dresden Amen." The chants and the hymns, like the prayers, are utterly without order or plan in arrangement and seem confusing and difficult to refer to, although the index classifies them under the abstract topics of the antiphons; and the adaptation of music to words seems as strange and hard to account for as the lack of "form" or order in arrangement. Thus it seems strange to see the beautiful "Mariner's Hymn" of Clifford Smyth inserted as the second in the collection between a hymn for the opening of worship and the hymn "Guide me O Thou great Jehovah"; this to be succeeded by "Cast thy burden on the Lord," with the abrupt change next to "Hark, the song of Jubilee," and, immediately, "Fierce was the wild billow." But no more surprising is this disarrangement than to see the sorrowful hymn, "Jesus, my Savior, look on me for I am weary and oppressed," set to a distortion of the joyful air, "With verdure clad" from Haydn's "Creation"; or to see one of the most familiar airs for "Hark, Hark, my soul," put woefully out of joint for adaptation to "Daughter of Zion," a hymn in quite different verse-form and for which an abundance of good tunes have been written. In general the liberties taken throughout the book in abusing classical and standard tunes and harmonies to meet the needs or taste of the compiler will seem to the musical critic quite unpardonable. There is no lack of catholicity in the selection of either words or music for the hymns or the chants. Notwithstanding the Academy's old-time aversion to everything bearing the name or insignia of the "old church," — going so far as to insist, in days past, on having an entirely new version of the Scriptures to sing from, — we find here the old, authorized version of the Bible, a selection of hymns from all types of old church writers, — Calvinist, Reformed, Roman, Greek and Unitarian, — all subjected, we have no doubt, to the only necessary criterion, namely, that they are good utterances in devotional form and spirit of things that are true in doctrine and in accord with the Divine Word.

One instance of what may seem to some an extreme example of this liberality is the insertion in the "3rd Antiphon on the Unity of God" of that verse from the first Epistle of JOHN v, 7,

which the old church has always regarded as the ground for belief in a trinity of persons but which the recent texts have thrown out as spurious, namely: "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one." It is true that Swedenborg quotes these words in "True Christian Religion" n. 164, among the proofs of the Divine Trinity, but they are not from the canonical Word of the New Church, — unless we regard Swedenborg's quotation of the passage from the Epistles as equivalent to making it canonical. We think the service would have been more harmonious without it. In this antiphon, as in the others, it is extremely difficult to trace a logical connection between the minister's verse and the people's response. Thus, in answer to the above announcement of a Divine Trinity comes the response, "Shew me Thy ways, O Lord, teach me Thy paths"; and following the minister's statement that "He that seeth me, seeth Him that sent me," there comes the response, "The just shall be glad in the Lord and all the upright in heart shall glory." Much of the responsive arrangement seems to the reader to be quite arbitrary and mechanical because without sequence either in the letter of the Word or in the apparent sentiment. But perhaps this is explainable by some reason which is not apparent on the surface.

As said at the outset, our criticism of this new "Liturgy" is called out rather by our sense of its real worth and deserts, than by any desire to derogate from its merits or from its usefulness. We have been free to criticize in the points, most of them of minor significance, in which we think the work is defective. The great defect, it seems to us, is its lack of a human form or an orderly sequential arrangement after the pattern of the Word. But this new arrangement according to doctrinal themes may be only an incident of experiment and growth to lead to a more matured form and beauty in the future. We have, we feel assured, been quite as free and glad to express our commendation as our disapproval, and in any case we can leave this as all the efforts made in sincerity of purpose, to the ultimate verdicts which only time and experience can bring.

FRANK SEWALL.

THE DUTY OF THE NEW CHURCH TO SOCIAL REFORM.

Quia nunc habemus unum Deum in Ecclesia qui est Deus Homo et Homo Deus vocatur illa Corona omnium Ecclesiarum. [As we have now in the Church one God, who is God-Man and Man-God, this Church is called the crown of all Churches.] (Invitation to the New Church, 53.)

This is the crowning truth in the crown of all the churches, that we have one God who is God-Man and Man-God and He is the Lord Jesus Christ; and flowing from this supreme acknowledgment of His Divine Humanity the healing waters of His Word come down to cleanse and purify all things of man even to the lowest element of his natural mind where the particular influx he receives from the Lord through heaven and the angels terminates as it meets the general influx flowing through the world of spirits into his animal body in common with the rest of the animal world, "for man is born an animal but becomes a man." But how the doctrine from the Word flows down to influence this ultimate of man's natural life and make it into the foundation and the instrument of that life of uses which forms man for heaven, this is the story of redemption, the gospel of good tidings, that can only be seen in its fulness in that exposition of the Word and of heaven which we know as the writings of the New Church.

It is part of the angelic wisdom, we are told in the work on the "Divine Love and Wisdom," to know that:—

A man cannot be conjoined to the Lord unless he is spiritual; nor can he be spiritual unless he is rational; nor rational unless his body is in a sound condition. These things are like a house; the body is like the foundation, the rational is like the house built upon it, the spiritual is like the contents of the house, and conjunction with the Lord is like dwelling in it. (330.)

And the reason given for this resemblance is, that since the end of creation is the angelic heaven from the human race,

consequently the human race itself, therefore all other created things are mediate ends, which, as they have relation to man, respect these three things, his body, his rational principle, and his spiritual principle, for the sake of conjunction with the Lord.

So far in the history of the New Church as an organization, the chief attention, of those whose business it has been to make known its doctrines, has been given first of all to pointing out the errors and falsities that have been substituted in the first Christian Church for the genuine truths taught by the Lord at His first coming, and recorded in the gospels. This was then the duty of the hour, and well indeed have the earlier workers of the church performed it. Hartley, Noble, Clowes, Bailey, Giles, and very many others who have fought the good fight and gone to their reward, will be remembered in the New Church and associated with this early labor of pulling down the stronghold of falsity and erecting the standard of truth in its place. The older members among us to-day have seen the work being done and may rejoice to know that it is to a large extent accomplished, for it is a matter of common knowledge that the old doctrines of predestination to hell, of a vicarious atonement to satisfy the wrath of God, of salvation by immediate mercy, or by faith alone, of a trinity of persons in the Godhead, and of the resurrection of the earthly body are no longer preached in their crudity and many of them rarely preached at all.

But what has been the result? Have the New-Church doctrines taken their place; has the New Jerusalem descended from heaven so that we may now say that the kingdoms of the world have become the kingdoms of our God forever? Far from it. The superstructure of a perverted and falsified rational has to a large extent been taken down; but the foundation, the body of social and civil life, is not sound, nor in any condition to receive and sustain the rational life of a pure morality as taught by the New Church, much less a spiritual life that could be conjoined to the heavens and so to the Lord. Doubtless the

separation, that always occurs at the decline and close of a church and the establishment of a new one, of the spiritually good from those who are only natural, is now taking place; and in the meantime the preaching in the various churches becomes more external and natural and less spiritual. And when we remember that as religion was considered to consist so much in belief alone, and faith was looked upon as the chief factor in man's redemption, it is easily seen that when faith perishes, nothing is left but natural good, which, apart from spiritual truth, always elevates itself on a throne and poses as the divine in man, as it is now doing in the many new cults and forms of self-worship that have sprung up on the ruins of the old beliefs.

The New Church which, as an organization, bravely by its preaching, and more by its publications, helped to bring about this state of things, now finds the sphere of its usefulness changed, and, instead of a priestly domination enforcing belief in false doctrines by threats of excommunication here and everlasting punishment hereafter, is confronted by a dis-integrated church and body politic shaken out of its old beliefs, adrift without competent leaders, a prey to trusts, combines, and corporations who sap the very foundations of the laws of justice and equity by bribing the law-makers and altering the laws for their own aggrandizement; split up also into parties in religion and politics, as well as into social classes, each of which is striving for the mastery. It finds the masses of mankind in a state of turmoil and unrest, no longer satisfied with the old order or the old leaders and teachers, and yet not knowing where to look for better ones, and very much in need of guidance on the natural and spiritual-natural planes of its life, while relying almost entirely on force to keep the peace, not only between nations, but among the various sections of the communities themselves.

In this extremity has the New Church, without whose coming, we are instructed, the human race must have perished, no help to give, no message or word of guidance as to the proper

order of those planes of human life on which the church is founded; no warning how to shun the evils that afflict society, how to heal the internecine strife of capital and labor, of the wealthy and the needy; no advice as to how to make this wilderness of human strife and passion into the garden of God?

Certainly it has. From the beginning to the end of those marvellous expositions of Divine truth entrusted to it, humanity, and the good of humanity are the themes. Nothing that affects the interests of the human race on its pathway to heaven lies outside the scope of this crown of all the churches, for it contains all the knowledges that man needs for every state through which he passes from the cradle to the grave; it gives out light on every subject where only darkness and ignorance reigned before. Under this new and beneficent dispensation of Divine truth all things are to be made new; and under its effulgent rays man's life, from the lowest blind passions of the sensual, the ultimate degree of the natural mind, up to the highest aspirations of the opened celestial, nearest to the Lord, order will reign; and only man's deliberate choice of evil will stay his progress towards the heavenly goal. Not, of course, that the Word, either in its letter or in its now opened internal sense, was written to teach men the sciences. These they may learn and read in the unwritten Word, the work of the same Almighty hand, the great bright world around them; and though natural phenomena are but effects in the world of effects, yet, by the newly unfolded science of correspondences, we may trace them to the world of causes where they all originate; and there we find that they are but an image of man for whom they all exist. "Each and all things of the universe have such a correspondence with each and all of the things of man that it may be said that man also is a kind of universe" (Divine Love and Wisdom, 52), and although the human body and all its organs are but dust and ashes, yet because of their correspondence with the spiritual things from which and for which they exist, we learn that "all things which can be known of the will and understanding, or of love and wisdom, may be known from the cor-

respondence of the heart with the will and of the understanding with the lungs"; thus are we led from effects to causes and to causes of causes; and, as we are also taught that every society of men is a man, the correspondence holds good with the community as with the individual; and heaven itself has, as we know, its heart and lungs, which also are love and wisdom in form. Consider, therefore, for a moment how immense is the field of study, and how little it has been opened or used by any of us who own these books of wisdom; for there is first, the actual heart and lungs of the body, and their interrelations; next, their correspondence with the will and understanding of the individual; above that their correspondence with the society in which he lives; then with his country; then with the church; and lastly, with the kingdom of the Lord, the heart and lungs of heaven; and thus, as to the heart, it is represented through all these successive stages by the degrees of love or charity, and as to the lungs, by the degrees of faith, or truth. The transitions are from material to various mental planes, next to spiritual, and lastly to celestial planes; wherefore they become more and more fit recipients of the love and wisdom from the Divine.

From this point of view look abroad on the present condition of the nations of the world, all of them in a state of unrest, and more or less in a state of suppressed revolution — suppressed by force; and almost all of them preparing for war under pretence of keeping the peace; while at the same time the true temporal and the true eternal interests of each, of the millions of men and women of whom they are composed are not only similar, but identical. What then is the lesson that every one of them requires to learn? Can it possibly be anything else than to be shown that they are all of one family, all created by their Divine Father on exactly the same plan, to be instructed, to have the plan and design of human life, its progress, its destiny, and its difference from the animals, explained to them? Should they not be told that far above all differences of nationality, of race, or of creed, deep within all forms of

custom, habit, and modes of living, lies the human soul, alike in its beginnings, all in peace and harmony in the heaven of human internals, and all alike born into the innocence of ignorance, all alike prepared by the needful states implanted to meet and combat the unrest, the cupidities and lusts, and their temptations in the after days; all becoming conscious at first only of the sensuous; then passing through the scientific and the external rational, to enter in adult life the battle with heredity, and the shunning of evil as sin against God; helped in every case through all the sorrows and troubles of this mortal life; no one forgotten or uncared for, along that rugged road, that arduous path, which leads to heaven, that heaven to which we all are predestined, but in order to reach which we must strip ourselves of our pride and our self-love, our false beliefs and our self-esteem. Must not, then, the New Church awake to the appreciation of the fact that the era of destructive criticism is passing and that of constructiveness beginning, that the great problem of the present is, how to build up human character of the angelic type, and that the proper study of mankind is man? Man, from his first beginnings as an animal, — "Man is born an animal but becomes a man," we are told (*Divine Love and Wisdom*, n. 270), — through all his progressive states of regeneration as an individual; and man, in his compound form as a community, has thus far sought in vain for the true ideal, the perfect type, on which to found and build a worthy and orderly social, civil, and moral life. For hitherto, no anatomist of the mind and soul has shown the individual and collective form of man's mind and life, from the spiritual point of view. Only in the light of the new revelation can be found the knowledges necessary for the reformation of the world. Until they are made known, and become the common property of all who are desirous of bringing their collective and individual lives into true order, the New Church can not become acknowledged as the "crown of all the churches"; because it can never be established and reign in cities and countries where the vast majority of men are consumed by the lust of greed, and are constantly

endeavoring to sacrifice the common good to their own selfish gains. Only where true order reigns in the moral, civil, and social planes, can the church of the Lord be built and established, for they must of necessity be first set in order.

That this order is discoverable as to its principles is evident from the "Doctrine of Charity" and the "Doctrine of Life," which teach it and are a part of the new revelation; and that these teachings come down to, and are based upon, the natural life of man and the material things of the world is also evident from such passages as the following:—

The human blood in its inmost principles is spiritual, in its outermost principles corporeal; wherefore, they who are spiritual nourish it from such things in nature as correspond to things spiritual, but they who are merely natural nourish it from such things as correspond to it; hence the dissimilitude of the blood in men is as great and of such a quality as is the dissimilitude of their loves, for the blood corresponds to the love. (Divine Wisdom in Apocalypse Explained, x. 6.)

It is easy to comprehend, therefore, that, as with the individual, so with the compound man or community, the latter cannot be spiritual unless it be rational, nor rational unless its body be in a sound state—the condition of the collective or communal body referring to the sanitary state of the dwellings and streets, the social customs and the civic ordinances.

It is by no means meant by the foregoing that every minister of the New Church is to be a social and civil reformer, advocating in the pulpit or on the platform such remedies as, on the social plane are applied to the temperance question, or on the civil plane insisting on the single tax; but simply that he should teach the principles, as set forth in the New-Church doctrines, that inculcate the needful reforms on those planes, leaving the application of these principles to the citizens, just as he has hitherto left the application of the laws of spiritual life to the freedom and rationality of his hearers. But it is intended to appeal to all such ministers to bring out of the treasure-house and put forward these teachings as to the necessity of order and the true form of order on these planes of com-

munal human life, the moral, the civil, and the social, where alone evil can and does abide, with the intent that when they are reformed, men may be more at liberty to build up a spiritual life on them as a house is built on its foundation.

For in that all-comprehensive system of truth there are doctrines bearing on the communal life and showing the necessity of every man having the opportunity of doing uses for which he is best fitted; and it is clearly pointed out that every man must perform some use for his fellowmen, or he cannot be regenerated; thus it is also shown that isolation, even for the purposes of piety and prayer, is detrimental to spiritual progress; so it follows that men must live in communities and do business together or they cannot be prepared by the Lord to live together in the heavens.

It is also important that the true form of education, and the preparation of children for their after life as citizens, should be expounded from the "Doctrine of Charity," and the other books where it is taught; and above all, the teaching that when they have become good civil and moral men, they will have but to acknowledge the Divine in their civil and moral lives to be spiritual men,—as we read in "Divine Providence": "Live these laws, not only as civil and moral laws, but as Divine laws, and you will be a spiritual man" (322), by which it is plainly evident that every man requires to be instructed as to what constitute true civil and moral laws, for only such can ever be lived as Divine laws. As it is only in the New Church that knowledge of such civil and moral laws as correspond to spiritual laws can be acquired, it follows that to teach concerning them is the plain duty of that Church.

The order of instruction, therefore, would begin with the individual man, that is, first, the construction, order, and progress of man's natural mind in its three discrete degrees, the sensuous, scientific, and external rational; secondly, the construction, order, and progress of the communal life in its three discrete degrees, the social, the civil, and the moral; and thirdly, the acknowledgment of the Divine in these, and thereby the

formation of conscience, and thence the opening of the three discrete degrees of the spiritual mind, namely, the spiritual-natural, the spiritual-proper, and the celestial, which are in the order of man's regeneration, and are the habitation of the Divine Human which makes heaven. By this means one of the great hindrances to man's heavenward progress, here spoken of, would be eliminated:—

There are two things with man which prevent his becoming celestial, one of which pertains to his intellectual part, the other to his voluntary part, the former being the unprofitable scientifics which he imbibes during childhood and youth, the latter the pleasures and the cupidities which he favors; these are what hinder his arriving at celestial things. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 1542.)

What are these unprofitable scientifics but all the teachings of the glory of war and the grandeur of wealth and titles, together with the evolution of the natural universe from external and natural forces only, ignoring the Divine? These can be and will be, as the New Church descends and sheds its beneficent light into the world, relegated to the list of forgotten falses, and all the sciences will be readjusted and reinforced by an internal acknowledgment of the Divine. Cosmogony and biology and all the circle of the sciences will be made anew, for a soul will be infused into them; their dead bones will arise, and flesh and blood will be formed around them. They shall stand upon their feet and help men to acknowledge the Lord, instead of, as now, to deny Him.

And then men will look back upon this present time as the remnant of the dark ages, darkest just before the dawn; and we shall cease to commemorate battles and bloodshed, wars and strife; and celebrate only the good things of this life, and above all, the second coming of the Lord to establish the crown of all the Churches.

T. MOWER MARTIN.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ITS INTERNAL ASPECT.

THE Lord Jesus Christ has Himself told us in a memorable chapter of the Gospel of John that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Being or Man, and not a mere breath of air or sphere of Divine gas. By no means therefore is the Holy Spirit a mere influx. The Lord has most emphatically presented the Holy Spirit before our eyes as The Comforter, as a Divine Being that the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but Whom we know, for He dwells with us, and shall be in us, and will teach us all things. It is evident that no words could have been used that would have more clearly and emphatically conveyed the idea that the Holy Spirit is a real Divine Being or Man, and so in fact the Christian world has always regarded Him.

It is true that the Lord has called this Divine Being a "Spirit," "the Spirit of Truth," and also "the Holy Spirit." And it is a fact that the common idea of a spirit is that he is a kind of breath or wind, for the word "spirit" means this. Nevertheless it is well known to the members of the New Church that a spirit is a real man, possessed of every viscus, member, sense, and organ of sense, and of every form of the body, from the crown of the head down to the sole of the foot, that belongs to every man in this world. Much more must this be the case with a Spirit who is Divine. It is evident that such a Spirit must be an infinitely perfect Human Form. The Holy Spirit therefore is God Himself in a Human Form.

It is to be feared that this great doctrine of the Word has not always been sufficiently kept in view even by those who are privileged to know the real nature of a spirit. Nor is this to be wondered at. The Divine Revelation that has been made to the world through the instrumentality of Emanuel Swedenborg

often uses language about the Holy Spirit that at the first view may give to some the idea that the Holy Spirit is a mere influx, because He is there called a "proceeding," and this word may easily be supposed to describe something that flows out of something else, as, for instance, light and heat out of the sun. But this is only a natural idea about the Divine that proceeds from the Lord, because it is based on the idea of space. Like many other natural ideas, this idea is not false; it is true as far as it goes, and perhaps it is necessary as a beginning. But it is very clear that it does not go nearly so far as that which the Lord has Himself taught us out of His own mouth. The Holy Spirit is indeed a Proceeding, but He is not a mere Proceeding. Seeing that the Lord is omnipresent, it is evident that in reality nothing can ever literally proceed out of Him, for there is no place for it to go to. He is already everywhere. Wherever His Proceeding is, there He must be altogether. The Lord has Himself stated this in clear language in this same wonderful fourteenth chapter of John in these words, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." The Holy Spirit, in fact, is Himself. The Holy Spirit is a Divine Man. And this Divine Man is our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and no other.

All this is admitted by everybody who believes the Word, and it is incontestable. But behind all this there remains the question, What, then, is the Divine Human called "the Son"? Is not this Divine Human also the Lord Jesus Christ Himself? And if so, what is the difference between this and the Holy Spirit?

This question is answered in our Heavenly Doctrine in no uncertain manner. The "*Arcana Coelestia*" dwells much upon the subject, and cannot be fully quoted here; but let us take the following most enlightening statement:—

The Divine of the Lord in the Heavens is what is represented by the priesthood of Aaron and his sons. . . . It is said "in the Heavens," because the Lord Himself is above the Heavens, for He is the Sun of Heaven; and yet His presence is in the Heavens, which is such as if He Himself were there. He Himself in the Heavens, that is, His Divine good and Divine

truth there, can be represented; but not His Divine above the Heavens, because this cannot fall into human minds, not even into angelic minds, for it is Infinite. But the Divine in the Heavens thence derived, is accommodated to reception. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 9946.)

This magnificent exposition teaches us a number of most important truths which may be thus tabulated: —

1. There are two Divines, one above the Heavens, and one in the Heavens.

2. The Divine above the Heavens is Infinite, and therefore cannot appear to the human mind, for even the angels cannot grasp or take in what is infinite.

3. This Divine is so far above human apprehension that it cannot even be represented, and consequently was not represented even by Aaron the High Priest, although Aaron represented the Lord.

4. The Divine in the Heavens can be represented, and was represented by Aaron and his sons.

5. This Divine is not absolutely infinite, but is accommodated to the reception of human minds, whether of men on earth, or of the angels in Heaven.

6. And, by inference, The Divine above the Heavens is what is meant in the Word by the Father and the Son, taken together; and the Divine in the Heavens is what is meant by the Holy Spirit, the Comforter.

But as this last proposition is an inference, it is necessary to give authority for it by direct quotation from our Heavenly Doctrine. In the "*Arcana*," very near the former quotation, we find this statement: —

The Lord Himself is above the Heavens, for He is the Sun of the angelic Heaven. The Divine which thence proceeds from Him into the Heavens is what is called The Holy. The Divine of the Lord above the Heavens could not be represented, because it is Infinite; but only the Divine of the Lord in the Heavens, for this is accommodated to the reception of the angels there, who are finite. In their perception this Divine is the Lord's Divine Human, which alone is Holy, and which was represented. . . . The Holy Spirit is the Divine that proceeds from the Lord. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 9956.)

This passage repeats much of what is contained in "Arcana" n. 9946, as above quoted; but it contains also the following additional propositions.

7. The Divine in the Heavens is the Divine which proceeds from the Lord, and which is called the Holy Spirit, from which it follows that the Divine above the Heavens is not the Holy Spirit, and must therefore be the Father and the Son.

8. In the perception of the angels the Holy Spirit is the Lord's Divine Human, from which it follows that in their perception the Holy Spirit is the Lord Himself, according to the Lord's own words in the Gospel of John which have been already quoted.

Such then is the difference between the Divine Human called the "Son," and the Divine proceeding called the "Holy Spirit." The former is the Divine above the Heavens, and the latter is the Divine in the Heavens, which in the perception of the angels is also the Lord's Divine Human; and this perception may safely be taken to be right, and to be a very good perception for us also to have, if we can.

But in the "Creed" of the New Church, and in our common idea, the "Son" is said to be the Divine Human, and the "Holy Spirit" the proceeding Divine. Thus a distinction is made between the Divine Human and the proceeding Divine, and how therefore can the angels be right in perceiving the Holy Spirit to be the Lord's Divine Human? The answer is that our "Creed" and the angels are both right; and in order to see this all we have to do is to look at the subject in the same way as the angels do, that is to say, in the way in which the subject is set forth in the two passages from the "Arcana" above quoted.

According to the teaching of these passages, the "Son" is the Divine Human in its own real nature, and therefore is infinite; whereas the "Holy Spirit" is the very same Divine Human in an accommodated form. All Newchurchmen are well aware that as soon as the Lord had fully glorified His Human it no longer remained in any respect finite, much less infirm; but became absolutely Divine, and therefore was Jehovah, as the Father Himself is Jehovah. It became Infinite, and therefore after

His resurrection the Lord said, "I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God." (John xx, 17.)

The Lord expressed this to His disciples in the fourteenth chapter of John by the words "I go away." He went away by ascending to the Father, that is, by becoming the Infinite Divine Itself. And if this had been all, it is evident that the world would have been no better off, in regard to having a Saviour, than it was before the Lord came into the world and took upon Himself the Human. But it was not all. The Lord immediately added the memorable words, "I come again unto you." This means that the Lord comes again as the Holy Spirit, for He had just said "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." Thus the Holy Spirit is indeed the proceeding Divine, or as it may be better expressed, "the Divine that proceeds." But this does not mean that the Divine which proceeds is not the Divine Human. In the words of our Heavenly Doctrine "that which proceeds from the Lord is the Lord." And this amounts to saying that the proceeding Divine is the Lord. Consequently it is the Divine Human. But it is not the Divine Human as this is in itself. It proceeds from this Divine Human, which is the same thing as the Lord such as He is in Himself; and by thus proceeding it becomes accommodated to human apprehension. This is what is meant by the term "proceeding"; not a literal proceeding, for this, as we have seen, is impossible; but a virtual proceeding, or descent from the Infinite down to the finite as this exists in angels and in men. The Divine in the Heavens, which is the Holy Spirit, is the Lord Himself revealed in a form that is accommodated to the apprehension of finite beings. It is the Divine Human thus accommodated. It is not the Divine Human banished or separated from us; not left behind in some region far above the Heavens; but the very Divine Human itself accommodated and thus made manifest to us, so that we can, if we will, see it with the mental eye, love it with the finite heart, and feel it ever present with us in every state of our minds, and in every moment of our lives.

It may occur to the thoughtful reader that in this presentation

of the doctrine we have still not got rid of the idea of space, and that therefore this presentation is after all a merely natural idea of the subject. And this is true, unless we remember that in a spiritual idea it is all the same whether we say "above" and "below"; or "within" and "without." Therefore when we speak of a Divine that is above the Heavens, what we really mean is a Divine that is within the Heavens, in the sense that it is not visible there, but is present there as a soul within a body. And if we desire to have a truly spiritual idea about the subject, we must indeed bear this point well in mind. Nevertheless when explaining the subject it is preferable to begin as is done in our Heavenly Doctrine, because this presents to the mind a graphic picture which is easily kept in view, and which is also perfectly true in so far as it goes. In this world we cannot wholly get rid of ideas based on space and time; but we can avoid confirming ourselves in these ideas, and making them the basis of our rational investigations.

We find a very interesting and a very striking use of this natural form of speech in the opening words of the Lord's Prayer: "Our Father who art in the Heavens." And it is most significant that this form of speaking is the very same that we find in the expressions, "the Divine above the Heavens," and "the Divine in the Heavens." For it leads at once to the conclusion that "Our Father in the Heavens" is the same thing as the Holy Spirit; and that when we are addressing this Heavenly Father we are addressing that Divine Comforter Whom the Lord promised that He would send to us, Who should abide with us forever, Who should dwell with us and be in us, and Who should teach us all things, and bring all things to our remembrance that the Lord has said to us in His Word. And therefore we may well say, This our Father in the Heavens is Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Himself presented before our mental sight in an accommodated Form, not merely infinite, but visible; Who has come down from His unapproachable abode in the Sun of Heaven to where we can lift up our eyes to Him with reverence and worship, and find Him not cut off from

us by an abyss we cannot pass over; for He is *in* the Heavens, as He has been graciously pleased to teach us to say when we pray to Him. This, then, we may exclaim with renewed and heartfelt joy, is the holy message that is now revealed to us in our Heavenly Doctrine, in the teaching which we may perhaps have hitherto passed over somewhat too unobservantly, regarding the Divine that is above the Heavens, and the Divine that is in the Heavens.

But this is not all that our Heavenly Doctrine has to say to us on this truly Divine theme. In one of the last works written by Emanuel Swedenborg namely, the "Apocalypse Revealed," the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is summed up in a few words of almost startling brevity and clearness, and which on account of their supreme importance I will quote from the original: —

Spiritus Sanctus est Dominus, est enim Divina Ipsius præsentia. (The Holy Spirit is the Lord, for it is His Divine presence.) (n. 949, subdivision 3.)

These inspired words of our Heavenly Doctrine are as precious as gold and diamonds, and should be written in letters of fire on every memory and every heart. "The Holy Spirit is the Lord." Not a breath of air; not a mere proceeding; not a sphere of Divine gas; not a mere influx; but the Lord Himself. It is not anything let down from Heaven into the minds of men that leaves the Lord Himself behind it; but it is the very presence of the Lord Himself with us. This surely is an aspect of the subject that we cannot safely pass by or slur over. It is moreover precisely what the Lord Jesus Christ said to His disciples: "I will not leave you orphans, I will come to you." Now if this is so, it is evident that the Holy Spirit is a very comprehensive thing. If the Holy Spirit is the Lord, as here stated in both the words of Scripture and those of our Heavenly Doctrine, it must be the whole of the Lord, for it is impossible to imagine that the Lord can be divided. Therefore the Holy Spirit is the embodiment of the whole of the Divine Trinity, not in successive, but in simultaneous order. The Holy Spirit is everything. When we pray to our Father in the Heavens, we pray to the

whole and complete Godhead. The Holy Spirit is the Lord Himself, and nothing short of this. It is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, in Whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. The Holy Spirit is the very presence of all this, because it is the presence of the Lord Himself. It is His accommodated presence. Without this accommodation we could no longer see our Divine Saviour, not even with the spiritual eye, which is the eye of the mind. But with this holy and precious accommodation we can indeed see Him as our Father in the Heavens. He does not leave us orphans. We still possess a Divine Father, Whom we can love with all our hearts. The Holy Spirit is this Divine Man, and nothing else.

From what has been said in this article it seems clear that the idea respecting the Lord that is expressed in the opening words of the Lord's Prayer is the only correct one to have about Him, namely that He is "in the Heavens." Anything beyond this must be a mistake, because we have seen that to attempt to pray to a Being who is above the Heavens is an attempt to pray to an Invisible God, while passing the real Lord by. According to our second proposition, the Divine above the Heavens is Infinite. And the Infinite is unapproachable and incomprehensible, even to the Angels of the highest Heavens. To pray to this must end in failure. This is what the Socinian attempts to do. He tries to go to God the Father direct, lifting up his thoughts above the Heavens, quite contrary to what is contained in the Divine injunction, "after this manner pray ye: Our Father Who art in the Heavens." It is self-evident that we cannot pray to the Infinite as it is in Itself, for of this we can know nothing. What the Lord is in Himself and to Himself, it would be sheer insanity to attempt to penetrate into. What we can attain to is an idea of the Infinite as presented to our minds in an accommodated form, that is to say, as revealed to us in the form of a Divine Father Who is in the Heavens, and Who is that same Divine Comforter Who is in us, and Who dwelleth with us.

But here the question will probably be suggested, "Is not the Divine that is in the Heavens also infinite?" Our Heavenly

Doctrine says, as above quoted, "the Divine above the Heavens cannot fall into human minds, for it is Infinite." But how about the Divine that is in the Heavens? Clearly, from the form of this statement in the Heavenly Doctrine it is not infinite, because if it were, it also could not fall into human minds. It is of course Divine, but it is not infinite. The superficial thinker is apt to imagine that everything Divine must be infinite; but if this were true we could receive nothing that is Divine, no Divine Love, no Divine Wisdom, no Divine aid, no Divine Truth, no Divine Word, for the finite mind cannot receive into its finite forms anything that is infinite. In order to be able to approach us, the Lord has "finited His infinity," as we read in the "True Christian Religion," n. 33, at the end. But this does not mean that by finiting His infinity the Lord made Himself in any respect undivine. Take Divine Truth for instance. There are six degrees of Divine Truth, and the two highest degrees of it are infinite, and are therefore above the understanding of the highest angels (*Arcana* n. 8443; *Apocalypse Explained* n. 627, subdivision 5.) But the four lowest degrees of Divine Truth are finited, and yet they are really Divine, down to the literal sense of the Word, which in fact is the most Divine of all the degrees, because all the higher degrees are within it in simultaneous order. This shows that there are some things which are Divine and which are yet not infinite. And such is the case with the Divine that is in the Heavens. It is evident that this cannot be infinite, because if it were so it would be just as unapproachable and incomprehensible as is the Divine that is above the Heavens.

We have thus far seen that although the Holy Spirit is a proceeding, it is not a mere proceeding in the sense that it is something which proceeds out of something else, as light proceeds out of a candle, or breath out of a man's mouth; but that it is the Lord Himself as seen in an accommodated form by the angels of Heaven with their very eyes, and also by men on earth with the eyes of their spirits, or mental sight. We have also seen that the presence of the Holy Spirit with us is not a presence with us

of a mere proceeding or influx, but that it is the presence with us of the Lord Himself. It remains to show what is the nature of this Divine Form which is thus present with us, and which is in reality the Lord Himself, and nothing short of this. And in order to do this let us look at the following most interesting statement of our Heavenly Doctrine on this point: —

When the Lord appears in Heaven, as often happens, He does not appear encompassed with the Sun, but in an Angelic Form, which is distinguished from the angels by the Divine shining through out of the face; for He is not there in Person, for in Person the Lord is constantly encompassed with the Sun; but He is in presence by look; for it is a common thing in Heaven that they appear as if present in the place where the look is fixed or terminated. This presence is called the presence of the internal sight. (Heaven and Hell, n. 121.)

This truly momentous passage contains the following propositions, which are additional to those we have already collected, and which may be set forth as follows: —

9. The Lord often appears in Heaven.
10. When He appears there He appears in an Angelic Form.
11. This Angelic Form differs from the other angelic forms in Heaven, which are the forms of those finite beings we call the angels, in that a Divine effulgence shines forth from the face, whereby all the spectators know that it is the Lord Himself who is then seen by them.
12. Nevertheless in His own Divine Person (that is, such as He is to Himself) the Lord is constantly encompassed with the sun of Heaven, and therefore He is not seen by the angels in His own infinite Divine Person.
13. When the Lord fixes His ever-merciful and most holy look in that region of His creation which is inhabited by those who are in conjunction with Him by faith and love, He appears there as present with them, and is actually seen in a glorious Form similar to their own in all respects except that what is Divine shines through it, and is seen in the face.
14. This kind of presence is not confined to the manifestation of the Lord in this manner, but is a general phenomenon in

Heaven, and a matter of frequent occurrence among the angels themselves, and is called by them "the presence of the internal sight."

In this connection we cannot fail to be reminded of the appearance of the Lord to His three disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration, for then also "His face did shine as the sun, and His garments were white as the light." It is evident that in much the same way does the Lord now frequently appear to the angels. And it is therefore clear that the angels can have no difficulty in forming a right idea about the Lord, and about His appearance when seen by human eyes. They see Him often, and in their perceptions (as we have already found) it is His Divine Human which they thus see. And the Divine Human, thus seen by the angels, is what is called in the Word the "Holy Spirit," and "Our Father who art in the heavens."

In bringing this article to a conclusion, the writer wishes to bespeak for it the thoughtful, the patient, and the prayerful consideration of his true Christian brethren. He is well aware that the aspect of the subject here presented is probably new to some of them. It is however by no means a new thing to the writer himself, but has been familiar to him in both his mind and his devotions for the major part of his adult life. And if anyone should ask, What is the use of this more internal view of the subject of the Holy Spirit? the writer would reply that in the first place its use is not to disturb the faith of anyone who is perfectly satisfied with his present view of the subject. No attack is here made upon anyone's view of it. The common idea that the Lord is high up above us, and from there sends down His Holy Spirit to us, is not false in any respect. It is an appearance that is not destructive of the real truth, and provided that it is felt to be sufficient there is no need to go any further. But for all that the fact remains that it is not sufficient for everybody. There are those within the Church who have always been able, as they think, to take a deeper and more spiritual view of the subject. I am glad to be able to mention here that I first obtained this idea about the Holy Spirit from a paper that was

written by that great New-Church theologian Dr. Rudolph L. Tafel, a copy of which is still in my possession. During the early years of my ministry I enjoyed the great privilege of being one of Dr. Tafel's intimate friends, and I continually imbibed from him the most profound instruction that has ever come within my reach from any living man. It was he, and he alone, who could answer my questions on profound points of doctrine; and in especial on the subject of this paper — the real nature of the Holy Spirit. And with regard to the practical use of this then to me new view of the subject, I will venture to say that its great use is that it enables us to come much closer to the Lord, to behold Him actually present with us in His own glorious Human Form, not far up in the sky, but present as the angels are present, so close that no one could possibly be closer, and thus to see Him near as our Heavenly Father, who has not gone away, and left us comparatively comfortless, but has actually come to us, as He promised to His disciples. This idea, this mental image, is very different from that which figures before our mental sight the Lord far up above us, and separated from us by an appearance of a vast space such as exists between us and the natural sun. And I think there can be no doubt whatever that it is an idea which enables the Lord to help us better, to influence us more powerfully, and to draw forth more fully and completely our deepest love and adoration. For, as I have tried to show, it is the idea which has for its basis not only the Heavenly Doctrine of the New Church, but also the very words of the Great Saviour of the world when here on earth speaking to men His own Divine words of absolute truth and imperishable power.

Behold the kingdom of God is within you. This, in reality, is where Heaven is, not above the sky, but present in the internal sphere of our regenerated thoughts and affections, and when we kneel down and pray to our Father in the Heavens, it is necessary to bear this in mind, to think of the Lord as being in this internal sphere, and consequently most intimately present with us, to dismiss all ideas of space, and to retain only those of state, only those which belong to a state of love, of holiness, and of

obedience to the will and commandments of our Lord. If anyone has any remaining doubt in respect to the usefulness of this more internal aspect of the doctrine and conception of the Holy Spirit, let him try when praying to think of the Lord in this way, and if he then does not find an increase of comfort and happiness from such a thought, then let him abandon it forever, or at least until he is able to return to it with a sense of heavenly joy and peace.

JOHN FAULKNER POTTS.

PROFESSOR JAMES' RADICAL EMPIRICISM.

THE field of philosophy at the present time is alive with new impulses and with fresh efforts to deal more successfully with the perennial problems of life and the world. There is a widespread and pervasive condition operating which may be called an epochal spell of philosophical weather. If we attempt to analyse the conditions and to make out the general tendency of winds and currents in the atmosphere of present-day philosophical thought and opinion, we may set down, as perhaps the characteristic movement of the age, a deep-seated and determined spirit of reaction in the younger generation of philosophers. From the days of Berkeley and Kant down to the appearance, in the closing hours of the nineteenth century, of Royce's "The World and the Individual," modern idealism held almost undisputed sway over the minds of students and teachers of philosophy. The "common sense" philosophy of the Scottish school, the French positivism, and the German materialism, were half-hearted and ineffectual protests which ended in virtually accepting the idealistic analysis of experience. T. H. Green and F. H. Bradley transplanted German idealism to English soil at Oxford. Professor Royce at Harvard, sweeping the field of history with a masterly critical review, gave constructive idealism a consummate expression, which seemed for the moment to signalize final triumph.

But in the meantime rumblings were heard in various quarters, and with the opening of the new century a counter movement broke, with impetuous energy, into the current of philosophic opinion. The impressive and effective personality of William James moved to the front and became what might be called the militant center of the reactionary forces. With a thorough psychological education, with a wide acquaintance with literature, with extraordinary powers of expression, and with a transparency, freedom, and audacity perhaps unpar-

alleled in professorial circles, Professor James attacked both the methods and the conclusions of idealism. The central object of his attack was the conceptualist habit which he anathematized as "vicious intellectualism." Opposed to this he placed the every-day facts of perceptual experience, and asserted the prior and superior reality of this as against that of conceptual experience. The background and the instrument of this attack has been the use which is made of the conceptual apparatus in the physical sciences. As a result of systematic reflection upon the nature of scientific method, it has come to be generally recognized that in science, as elsewhere, conceptual thought is a short-hand way of dealing with the overwhelming complexities of concrete fact. Concepts are formed by abstracting certain features of the objects about us, especially common characteristics and uniformities of behavior. In this way we constitute classes and laws which enable us to say of groups and systems and remote situations what we directly observe in the special cases; for example, cherries are red, acorns become oaks, an arch of the New Boston bridge will bear a strain of five thousand tons. Such processes are of enormous practical value. They help us marvelously to reduce the external world to order and bend it to our service. In fact the tremendous achievements of modern science are merely an instance of such application. But the sole and proper function of these conceptual processes is practical control of the environment. They do not lead to further information about the intimate nature of experience as it directly comes; but rather they lead more and more away from it, the more universal and abstract the conceptions become. They do not lead to reality but away from it. The thing to do, therefore, is to face about, abandon the conceptual schemes of Plato, and all the philosophers down to Bradley and Royce, plunge into the blooming, buzzing confusion of sensible experience, and there make direct acquaintance with genuine reality. This motive characterizes the whole reactionary movement. In so far as it turns from the abstract to the concrete, from thought to sense, from philosophic speculation to common sense,

for reality it is "new realism." Professor Fullerton is a good representative of this phase of the movement. In so far as it places the emphasis on the instrumental function of thought in directing conduct, it is "pragmatism." Here the most effective worker has been Professor Dewey. The effort to break away from the idealistic doctrines about the absolute, and to find reality directly and solely in human experience, is characteristic of Professor Schiller of Oxford and the "New Humanism."

All these tendencies are more or less pronounced in Professor James, but his thought is signalized by the frank acceptance of sense experience as the raw material of reality. This taking experience simply as it comes, he designates, "radical empiricism," to distinguish it from the older forms of empiricism which accepted to a greater or less extent the results of idealistic analysis; for instance, the psychological elements of the associationists.

The significance of such a radical empiricism is twofold and may be described briefly as positive and negative. It must be said that as yet the negative aspect is the more important, or at least it has been more effective. Professor James' attitude towards idealism, and towards absolutism in general, is partly temperamental and partly intellectual. He is thoroughly infected with hereditary opposition to all forms of the static, the conventionalized, and the institutionalized. He is the foe incarnate of officialdom, the paragon of the free-lance, undoubtedly the most highly equipped and the most irresistible of the free-lancers of our day. No one can read Professor James' philosophy with intelligent appreciation who has not received the direct impress of his personality. As a revolutionary leader he seems to be nature's supreme offering. Graciously endowed with a genial disposition, hospitable to every person, place, or thing that has the mark of freshness or originality; singularly free from the restraints of conventionality or the prepossessions of class; unreservedly communicative; spontaneous to the last degree; brilliant, bold, he plunges *in medias res*, laying about him with a sort of iconoclastic fury, but at the same time the unfailing

possessor of a marvelous sense of real values. With this endowment and equipment he is ever ready as knight errant to espouse and champion any cause that appeals to humanity, or as commander-in-chief to lead the organized forces of civilization in new paths to the experience of life's realities. Such a temperament, reinforced by trained abilities, would inevitably react against the philosophical conditions of the last few decades, wherein idealism, sanctioned by traditions co-extensive with the highest products of civilization and enthroned in all the strongest professional centers, has attracted and compelled almost complete unanimity and acquiescence. Already in the early eighties we see stirring in Professor James' mind all the elements of the new realism, the new humanism, pragmatism, and radical empiricism. Even then, as we see in those epoch-making essays published under the title of "The Will to Believe," the reactionary forces were gathering strength and becoming disciplined for the general engagement which we are now witnessing.

The burden of these essays is the assertion, with telling effect and clear vision, that the practical interests of men, not purely rational considerations, determine the issues of life. "The Will to Believe" is precisely the right to choose among live alternatives where the intellect is unable to guarantee one course rather than the other; that is, in cases where positive knowledge is not obtainable. As a matter of fact, life is, from the human point of view, full of chances, and the only way to make the most of it is to take the chances. On the whole, it is more sensible, and in the end more reasonable, to yield belief than to withhold it. Ordinary life presents many situations where it is immaterial whether we believe or disbelieve. In such cases we may properly withhold belief until the evidence is all in. The nebular hypothesis, the metaphysical theory of atoms, the final extinction of the sun and the solar system, the simian origin of man, the discovery of the north pole, are questions of the kind which we may properly hold in suspense. They present, for most of us at least, no "live alternatives." But the existence of God, immortality, the truth of the Christian religion, the credibility

of Swedenborg, the democratic ideal, involve moral issues which cannot be evaded. Belief in cases like these makes a practical difference. Here we have a "forced option." Either take the chance or do without the truth. The fear of being in error is cowardly when we are faced with the opportunity to get the truth. Furthermore, taking the risk and making the choice may be just what is needed to bring the truth to pass. We thus take part in making truth, as Thomas Jefferson made democratic truth by the Declaration of Independence, or Swedenborg made religious truth by believing in his mission. We may do the same. This is a clear and definite anticipation of the future, more developed, doctrine, namely, the subsidiary function of thought, the relatively more fundamental and efficacious character of the will, and the pragmatic value of truth. In fact, all the essays of this volume are precisely various luminously presented aspects of the contrast between the voluntary and the intellectual life. The will to believe that "life is worth living" is the proper way to make it worth living. Reason with all the aid of science and philosophy cannot decide this question *in abstracto* for the individual inasmuch as the will, the choice, and the character of the individual, determine the life. The Sentiment of Rationality is the feeling of ease and satisfaction with which we go through in thought a given situation and pass from one fact to the next. A rational world is one where we are at ease, and an irrational world is one in which we cannot get on. We help to make the world rational by faith in our demand that it be rational and by acting in accordance with this faith. The discussions in Reflex Action and Theism, The Dilemma of Determinism, The Moral Philosopher and Moral Life, Great Men and their Environment, are only various forms of the assertion that the fundamental and efficacious fact in the world, or at least in human experience, is the willingness or the unwillingness of the individual man. The essay On Some Hegelisms, is an ominous attack on intellectualism and on the "dialectic process"; but it is also a clear and forcible affirmation of radical empiricism. In point of style, literary wealth, pene-

trating insight, fresh grasp of essential features and significance, effective criticism, telling exposition, these essays are genuinely creative, and Professor James' subsequent work has been in the main an elaboration in detail of the motives and results here so admirably set forth.

To summarize, experience as it directly and immediately comes presents incalculable variety and incessant change. It also presents numberless identities and uniformities. The demands of practical life emphasize the characters of sameness, permanence, and uniformity of behavior among objects. These characters enable us to group, to classify, to establish, to plan, to predict, and to execute. In short, they enable us to bring the primal chaos of experience into some sort of order; and we utilize this order in carrying out our purposes. Raw experience gives us such facts as apples falling from the trees, drops of rain from the clouds, stones rolling down the hillside, water rushing down stream, and innumerable other cases. We collect all such instances under the head of falling bodies. After further analysis, abstraction, and generalization, we formulate the law of gravitation, which says, every body, large or small, in the universe approaches or tends to approach every other body with a force, or at a rate, inversely as the square of the distance between them. Raw experience also gives the waving branches and swaying tree tops, the rebounding spring-board, the sledge hammer descending with crushing effect upon the granite rock, the shock and divergence of billiard balls, rolling the log with a crowbar, the footbridge of a single plank across the stream, and so on. We proceed to identify, distinguish, separate and combine certain characters of such raw experience, and get the properties we call elasticity, hardness, brittleness, toughness, strength, movement, direction, energy, mass, and other conceptualized entities or figments of the imagination. Pushing abstraction and generalization to the extreme we have the laws of motion, the parallelogram of forces, the formula for the strength of materials, the principle of the lever, the wedge, and the screw. So on the basis of these very simple conceptual processes and

results, mankind has, through untold ages of intellectual effort, built up step by step the body of knowledge, or the system of abstract conceptions, which we call the science of mechanics. The amazing results in modern times of working with this system of conceptions in and upon the concrete world have immensely enhanced the practical value of abstract thought and confirmed philosophy immeasurably in its tendency to work with abstractions as the field of ultimate reality. When we realize that the houses we live in, the light and heat to make them habitable, the marvelous extension of social and commercial relations by telegraph and telephone, the transcontinental railroads and the ocean steamers, wireless telegraphy and flying machines, and, above all, the variety and volume of manufactures, are the direct out-come of mental operations of the most remote and abstract kind, we can more fully appreciate the historic preeminence of the rational faculty and the fact that early in the history of philosophy thought was set over against sense as relatively superior and more real; and we no longer wonder that Plato's philosophy culminated in the doctrine of ideas and modern philosophy reached the conception of the absolute. From this point of view it is easy to see that the highest achievements of Greek philosophy and of modern idealism grew naturally out of the bias towards abstract thought, determined in the first instance by the practical convenience and success of conceptual systems. It was natural and inevitable, then, that the Greeks, and after them the Moderns, should look to thought rather than to sense for the type of genuine knowledge and for ultimate reality. As a consequence philosophy has been a system of intellecticism, and the vices of intellecticism have infected it throughout its length and breadth. If, now, we observe that all these results are the outcome of just the act of selective attention to obvious, constant, and for some purposes important features of the environment, we see that the entire superstructure of both science and philosophy has arisen from the simple basis of elements selected out of the concrete mass of present fact. The basis has broadened with time, and the superstruc-

ture has been correspondingly enlarged; but in its whole extent and amazing complexity it is merely the outcome of mental operations upon the raw materials furnished by direct contact with the concrete world. With this interpretation of history, and with this view of the nature of science in general and in particular, it is inevitable that the traditional theory of knowledge and the historic trend of metaphysics should be subjected to new scrutiny.

No one has appreciated this situation more fully than Professor James, and no one has been more instructive in his exposition of it. Indeed, it may be truly said that if he had made no other contribution to the philosophy of the age than his radical criticism of the nature and outcome of the intellectualistic movement, Professor James' work would still be of monumental importance, and would furnish, along with Plato's "Dialogues," the best introduction to the study of philosophy in existence. But he has done more than this. Recognizing as few others have done the instrumental nature of thought, and accepting frankly and finally the logic of the situation, he resolutely faced about and undertook, with characteristic intrepidity and energy, to make it the task of philosophy to struggle with the concrete rather than with the abstract. He threw himself into the immediate flux of experience and labored heroically to identify, grasp, and win intellectual control over the characters therein presented. In doing this he encountered, as his first difficulty, the problem of knowledge itself. Having rejected as incomprehensible and vain the conceptualistic theory in so far at least as it involved a transcendent object, he sought for the whole nature of knowledge in actual experience, and found it in the relation between two stages of experience which are mediated by successive steps of transition from one stage to the other. In such a case the first stage is then said to know the second and so the last. This is one of the few radical attempts in history to make out the precise nature of knowledge as an experienced fact. It resolutely declines to recognize any transcendental, mysterious, or unintelligible character in knowledge, and undertakes to account

for every phase and stage of the process. It is at once evident that in this view the time-honored term 'object' loses some of its traditionary abstract characters. It no longer hangs in a remote and inaccessible realm, but subject and object are made absolutely coördinate and are kept on the same level. The mysterious and immeasurable chasm which epistemology has thrown between them is completely closed and filled in by perfectly familiar stages of transition from one end to the other of a serial process. Consistently with this view, the object is of the same essence and texture as the subject. The knowing state passes by stages over to the known. The 'object' is not to be conceived as a ready made prior existent, but, agreeably to current idealism, as the constituted effect of the transitional process.

If the 'object' is not this ready made prior existent, fixed in unchangeable reality, to which the knowing state, the idea, must conform *ab initio*, then the ordinary notion of truth must likewise be radically altered. We can no longer think of the truth as a static character of the object, an eternal self-existent norm, or type, to which knowledge must somehow conform by copying, by correspondence, or otherwise, on the penalty of being false. The truth, now like the object, is brought down from the ideal and abstract realm of eternal forms to the level of our passing experience. It becomes a perfectly recognizable and describable character of the knowing state, or idea. An idea is true when it passes, or may pass, by successive stages to the object of its reference and find itself therein satisfied, fulfilled. The idea becomes true in the process of making it true, and its truth is revealed and attained in the making. The relation between the initial state and the end state of this process is merely the felt stages of transition. There is nothing transcendental about the relation. It is in the strictest and most familiar sense an experienced relation. Herewith the mystery of truth is cleared away and we are brought into the familiar territory of actual, concrete experience, which it is the distinctive aim of "radical empiricism" to explore, to interpret, and to comprehend as the proper object of philosophical and metaphysical interest.

If this, in spite of its brevity, is a fair exposition of Professor James' point of view and of the fundamental features of his philosophy, it indicates sufficiently well the contents of his more recent books: "Pragmatism" (1907), "A Pluralistic Universe" (1909), and "The Meaning of Truth" (1909). In "Pragmatism" the aim was, besides demolishing conceptualistic metaphysics, to establish the instrumental character of thought and the empirical nature of truth. The volume of hostile criticism which this book aroused abundantly showed that it was not convincing in its main contentions. Granting that thought is characteristically instrumental, and that truth is, to use the language of Swedenborg, a form of good, nevertheless it remains to be shown more completely just what it is that thought is instrumental for, and what precise character of experience the word truth ultimately designates. Criticism seems to have shown that Professor James failed in his effort to restrict thought to its function of directing merely the concrete behavior of the psycho-physical organism, and to identify truth wholly with a character of the knowing state developed in degree by the stages of verification. True, it must be said that Professor James is amply justified in complaining of misconception and misrepresentation by his critics. The hostile criticism is in large part one more instance of professional stupidity, blind conservatism, and proprietary resentment. But after all, with due allowance for misdirected criticism which Professor James has effectively foiled, still the fact or at least the impression, remains that "pragmatism" is not philosophically acceptable either as to its theory of reality or as to its view of the ultimate nature of truth. If we run through the current philosophical magazines and follow the discussion *pro* and *con*, we see that Professor James has felt keenly the necessity of removing this impression. He has written many fragmentary but highly illuminating articles. He has in these articles lighted up many vital and obscure points, but the material is so scattered that it is very difficult to do justice to the positive and constructive achievements of his thought. However, both sides, the negative and critical, and

the positive and constructive, are perhaps fairly well presented in his two recent books: "A Pluralistic Universe," and "The Meaning of Truth."

The former, though at bottom a plea for "radical empiricism," is concerned more directly with over-throwing the whole intellectualistic scheme of logic as handed down from Aristotle and brought to wild confusion by Hegel, and with undoing that abstract unification of experience which this logic effects in the conception of the absolute. As against the empty abstractness and the hopeless unintelligibility of the absolute, is affirmed the obvious variety, change, and connectedness of the actual world. The inherent and characteristic vice of intellectualism is that of excluding from the object what is not included in the concept or definition of that object, resulting in that atomization of experience which rigorously forbids any possible connection between the isolated elements so defined. The process was once for all exemplified in the Zenonian paradoxes; and the persistent logical puzzles of continuity and infinity have borne witness to the vicious abstractionism of such conceptual metaphysics down to the present moment. Conceptual entities are the perfect type of isolation, disconnection, eternal sameness, and unrelatedness. The Democritean theory of atoms is the inevitable and the standing outcome of this vicious intellectualism turned to metaphysical account.

If, now, we make a serious effort to take experience as it comes, resisting the intellectualistic temptation, we actually find a moving panorama which is shot through with all sorts of transitions and connections, and in which there is opportunity for every kind and degree of selection and combination. In one sense, or in one aspect, things may be taken as infinitely many; in another sense, or in another aspect, they present various kinds of oneness, but the manyness is not the unrelated manyness of the world of conceptual entities, nor is the oneness that which is transcendently achieved in the absolute. In the concrete world of things there are no real and hopeless discontinuities. The tree trunk is continued downward into the roots, and

the roots are continuous with the elements of the soil. Upwards the trunk is continued into the limbs, branches, twigs, and leaves; the leaves, into the elements of sunshine. Things in some respects, or in some ways, pass into each other; in other respects, and in other ways, they keep to themselves. The world of actual experience furnishes unlimited opportunities for making connections, transitions, distinctions, unions, and dis-unions; but it affords no instances of unchanging and unrelated atoms. It yields ample oneness of the felt and perceived sort, but the function of the absolute in effecting an all-embracing and all-penetrating oneness, is unobservable and unintelligible. As in the outer physical world, so in the inner mental world we have the same play of unity and variety. Consciousnesses are one and many in all sorts of ways and we have the same transitions, connections, separations and combinations as in the outer world. There is as much compounding and unifying of consciousnesses as is actually felt and perceived, and there is no assignable limit to such compounding. But no absolute can reduce the disparity of two consciousnesses that take each other as unique and different. So the world as we find it is radically pluralistic, and no rational feature is added to it by superposing the absolute. With this rejection of the absolute goes every form of ultimate monism, and especially the prevalent idealistic monism which the absolute was primarily called into being to maintain. Pluralism and monism are two contrasting "types of thinking" which spring severally, the one from the empiristic motive, the motive to get experience as it comes in all its fulness and variety and keep it so; the other the rationalistic motive, the motive to symplify and unify experience as it comes, and to comprehend it as a whole. Surely both motives are legitimate each for its own purpose, and obviously experience lends itself to either; but in the pursuit of ultimate reality the empiristic motive has the proper warrant for the simple reason that reality is concrete whereas rationalism is only capable of giving abstractions.

In the book before us, this contrast is brought out in the open-

ing chapter on The Types of Thinking. In the chapters on Monistic Idealism, Hegel and his Method, and Bergson on Intellectualism, the rationalistic type of thinking is subjected to scathing criticism and its shortcomings forcibly argued, with the result already indicated. The superior claims of empiricism are ably set forth in the chapters concerning Fechner, The Compounding of Consciousness, again that on Bergson and His Critique of Intellectualism, and The Continuity of Experience. Fechner is a curious instance of the return of modern thought to animism and a form of polytheism. He seems to have been driven to this by fidelity to the empiristic motive. With an imagination richly endowed and stored with a marvelous wealth of images drawn from concrete experience, following his logical method of analogy, he assigned souls to the objects of nature generally, and thought of plant-souls, the earth-soul, and so on. A traditional monist, he naturally superposed a supreme all-enveloping soul, and conceived the universe under the form of pantheism. Nevertheless, he views God in other respects, for example, in relation to the problem of evil, in the way of ordinary theism. Here we catch a glimpse of the theological aspects of "radical empiricism."

In the case of Bergson we have a typical instance of systematic return through critical thought to raw experience as the proper field of reality. We have already suggested the critical aspect of this point of view in our reference to the continuities, the transitions, the connections, and the disjunctions actually presented in the concrete world. The outcome of Bergson's critique is the deliberate abandonment of intellectualistic logic as metaphysically irrelevant, however we may value it for practical purposes.

To sum up, "radical empiricism" accepts as the more rational view a pluralistic universe. It would even go so far in its effort to avoid the vicious tendencies and habits of intellectualism as to do away with the word rationality altogether; or perhaps better, to substitute for it the word *intimacy*, on the ground that after all the real essence of rationality lies precisely in the

feeling, or the experience, of intimacy in the actual world. A pluralistic universe would accept any order of superhuman personalities and ordinary theism would have a rightful place, but it would not tolerate "The Absolute," or any form of all-inclusive experience absorbing into itself all details and making all plurality insignificant and incomprehensible.

If now we have suggested even remotely something of the spirit, the method, and actual content of Professor James' philosophy, we may consider our task completed and rest in the conviction that we have done our readers a welcome service. Brief exposition necessarily puts the system under consideration at a disadvantage. The side lights, the context and massive effectiveness are all wanting. It would seem therefore, doubly ungracious, if not unfair, to attempt a critical estimate especially of a few selected and therefore isolated features. But a reviewer has his own proper responsibilities, and so it is perhaps a duty to be candid about the impression which this philosophy makes upon us. First of all, we must recognize the general wholesomeness of the effort to keep true to experience in its every aspect and character, especially the experience which the concrete world furnishes. It is undeniable that "radical empiricism" stands conspicuously for this effort. But the critical question arises, what advances has it made in getting at the ultimate nature and constitution of experience. The world has, of course, to be experienced, but, if only for practical purposes, it has also to be described, and description presupposes the recognition of common characters which must also be communicable. Herewith we are at once face to face with intellectual processes and complications. No doubt such a thing as "pure experience" is conceivable, and, it would seem, at the initial stage actual, but obviously at such stage it is dumb and incommunicable. Therefore, the mere fact of getting into the "concrete world," "the immediate flux of sensible experience" and "being in the swim," is both practically and philosophically insignificant. In any significant sense, then, certainly in any philosophical sense, experience is already inextricably complicated with all

sorts of intellectual processes, the outcome of which is more or less elaborate organization. With all his effectiveness in exposing the abuses and vices of intellectualism, and crediting him with masterful exposition of the practical functions of the intellect, it remains to be said that Professor James has restricted experience too much to its chaotic stage, and has comparatively neglected its more highly organized forms. It is, therefore, begging the question to assume that the pursuit of ultimate reality is fully defined by pointing to the concrete world of immediate experience; and Professor James seems perilously near doing just this. At any rate he seems to put too much emphasis on the concrete significance of the word *practical*, unless, indeed, he means the concrete to be taken consistently as co-extensive with the actual. But in that case "radical empiricism" and "pragmatism" lose much if not all of their force of contrast and become simply strong protests against obvious though common and very persistent abuses. The word of final criticism here cannot in fairness be spoken until we see "radical empiricism" at its best on its positive and constructive side as well as on its negative and critical. At present the pluralistic world which it gives us is professedly too much in the making to have the last word said about it, and therefore it may ultimately take on the characters of the absolute which it has prematurely excluded. It is fair to concede that the time-worn problem of the one and the many has not as yet been fully solved by any system of philosophy. Truth and reality may indeed be forever in the making, but if the Universe is really infinite this is just what we should expect, because it is implied in the very nature and existence of the Infinite.

Turning from these generalities, there is something further to be said in the way of special criticism of the pragmatic view of truth. Charles Peirce's famous dictum about the practical significance of conceptions may be as revolutionary as you please, but it is true only of that function of the intellect which develops the meaning of concepts after they have been once formed and are ready for practical use. If, however, we are going to be radical empiricists as well as pragmatists we must look a little

closer and observe to begin with the conditions of forming concepts. Here it seems that Professor James' analysis falls short, and his criticism of intellectual functions seems one-sided. Certainly, one intellectual function, which also seems to be primary, is that of selection. A character has to be selected out of the immediate stream of experience before it can be transformed into a concept; the transformation consisting precisely in the process of passing from the stage of mere awareness to that of more or less generality. But during the process, the act of selection must supervene, and this involves distinction and estimation. It seems, then, that we must recognize here an immediate perception of quality, and on the basis of this perception other intellectual acts proceed. The next point is that these qualities so perceived and selected are internal rather than external. They are intimate matters of feeling rather than characters given in the environment. In this direction we must look for ultimate reality rather than in the so-called brute facts of the external world. Here lies our fundamental objection to the theory of pragmatism in so far as it claims for the instrumental function of thought, finality and all-inclusiveness. Here also lies our objection to Professor James' "radical empiricism."

It remains to say a closing word about Professor James' latest book, "The Meaning of Truth." It is a collection of essays written for the most part during the later stages of the pragmatistic controversy, and in the main a defense against irrelevant criticism, along with various efforts to restate the case. It is a mistake to undervalue the pragmatistic view of the nature of truth. It cannot be laughed out of court nor driven from the field by denunciation. It rests on a helpful theory of cognition, and puts emphasis on a real and important aspect of the meaning of truth. But as to the question of its sufficiency we may well demur. To put it briefly, pragmatism asserts that truth is that character of the idea which refers to stages of transition, actual or possible, from itself to its object. This brings the truth relation as well as the object into the world of actual experience, and is merely one way of denying, with current idealism, the independent and unknowable object of traditional

realism. It may admit that the idea is true in such a case before the steps of transition are actually taken or even conceived, but so far as the word truth has any proper meaning, it relates to precisely these stages and nothing else. This insistence that truth is solely a property of the idea fails to do justice to the demand that the object be as it is conceived. It is this property of the object that guarantees the stages of transition from the idea to it. No such guarantee is inherent in the nature of the idea as such. From this point of view the truth is the character which the idea demands of the object, not merely that it exist but that it be eternally and absolutely what it is conceived to be. This secures to truth the character, so deeply imbedded in human thought and speech, of objective value. The pragmatistic account seems to shy at this value, and this is the main point of hostile criticism, and a point which Professor James has not succeeded in clearing up. For instance, it may be true that angels exist, although we cannot at will make or conceive the steps of transition from our present ideas of them into their actual presence. So too, God may exist as the infinite and absolute personality which He is conceived to be, in spite of the difficulties we have with our theories of the infinite and the absolute. The very essence of the truth, for the common mind at least, is that it is a type and a norm which is eternally valid. And these are precisely the characters which pragmatism is prone to deny.

No doubt it is significant and important to define truth as the form of good, but they must be kept coördinate. Truth and good constitute in Swedenborg's terms a distinct one. Pragmatism tends too much to subordinate truth. Truth and good are aspects of one life, one context of experience, as pragmatism insists; but this life, this context of experience, is not the mere flux of the moment: it is an infinitely complex organism, the type of which already exists in its completeness, but being infinite it contains within itself infinite possibilities of finite development and variation. Our concrete acquaintance with such an organism is given us in our actual experience of the combined functions of love, wisdom, and use.

LEWIS F. HITE.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE BIBLE AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

WHEN the higher criticism led Bible students generally to see that the early chapters of Genesis are not to be understood as literal history, but rather as allegory, it seemed a gain; for it confirmed the position of the New Church. And when it began to show that all the books of the Bible are not equally inspired, this seemed also likely to prove useful eventually, for the New Church had been regarded as heretical in teaching that some books had not a continuous spiritual meaning within that of the letter, and for this reason were not to be regarded as part of the Divine Word. And when the old theory of inspiration had to be abandoned, which had taught for centuries that the letter of the Sacred Scriptures is infallibly true and to be believed just as it reads in each verse, line, and word; this seemed to be well, for it promised to prepare the way for a new theory of inspiration; and the New Church has one to offer. But now the liberty of the Bible student, thus introduced, is carrying him farther than we could wish. However, we need not feel less hopeful that, under the Divine Providence, even this is a part of the preparation for the true doctrine of the Lord's second coming without which the Word cannot be understood.

Two years ago we called attention to Dr. William Sanday's remarkable presentation of the symbolism of the Scriptures, which seemed to be one of the best fruits of the higher criticism,* for he held that, not only the early chapters of Genesis should be interpreted symbolically, but that the same principle should apply to all the Scriptures. This came very near to a recognition of the New-Church doctrine of inspiration by means of a spiritual sense within the letter. It lacked, however, the important principle of correspondences as a scientific key to this symbolism. But no suggestion was then made of disturbing the historic basis of the letter itself, in the parts which are given as historical, after the eleventh chapter of Genesis. Even "Liberal Christianity," while subjecting certain

*NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, Vol. XV, No. 3, page 476.

parts of the Scriptures to critical scrutiny, and rejecting some statements as corruptions of the texts, or later interpolations, still depended upon the letter itself for its doctrines with which to oppose the orthodoxy of the past. The loss of confidence in the verbal inspiration and the infallibility of any part of the letter was enough to undermine the old orthodoxy. But now comes the logical result of such premises in the suggestion that nothing of the letter can be regarded as true history, for it all was written by the Church, many years after the occurrence of the events described, to present the conceptions of religion which had been forming as ideals in the minds of men from remote times. Its true value, therefore, is only symbolical. This hypothesis will sweep away the foundations of even "Liberal Christianity." Nothing will be left of the old way of understanding the Bible. All things of the Christian religion will have to be "made new." Will not this complete the vastation of the fallen first Christian Church? And shall we not recognize a great service thus rendered to the Lord in His second coming by the higher criticism, although we know that the truths of the letter should not be given up in finding a spiritual meaning within them. But in the upheavals and siftings of belief now going on, we may look for more gain than loss in the long run.

In the January number of the *Hibbert Journal*, is a remarkable article by the Rev. K. C. Anderson, D. D., entitled "The Collapse of Liberal Christianity." It begins: —

The cry of liberal theology for a good many years now has been, "Back to the Jesus of the Gospels," the assumption — the working hypothesis — being that the Jesus of the Gospels could easily be found. For some decades now, liberal theology has been engaged in the search for the historical Jesus, and the conviction is being slowly forced upon all candid inquirers that very little can be known of Him. Liberal theology is unwilling to admit this conclusion because it takes away the basis on which it rests — its working hypothesis — but it is not able to resist it. (Vol. VIII, page 301.)

Prof. James Denney's latest book, "Jesus and the Gospel," is then quoted to show that the very last analysis which criticism makes of the Gospels gives, not the Jesus of liberal theology, but the Christ of the Church. Liberal theology has been trying to show that the nucleus of historic fact is a historical Jesus who gave as the essence of religion love to God and man; and that the stories of miracle and supernatural dogma were accretions that were added by the primi-

five church in a superstitious age; and that the function of criticism is to separate the mythical from the historical. Dr. Anderson says: —

But as a matter of fact, the two cannot be separated; miracle and supernatural dogma are an organic part of the New-Testament presentation. Go as far back as you like in your investigation, what you have at last is a supernatural Christ. Even the Sermon on the Mount, on which liberal theology has planted itself as on a rock, is full of Christological elements. Nowhere do we get back to a historic Jesus. Not only have we not a biography of Jesus, we have not the materials out of which to make one. The words Jesus is represented as speaking were put into His mouth by a community or church who worshipped Him. We have no absolute certainty that any single saying in the Gospels was uttered in that precise form by Jesus. (*Ibid.*, p. 302.)

The New-Churchman is not disturbed by the discovery of the higher criticism, that the Gospels were thus written at a later time in the history of the church than was formerly supposed, and that the material was handed down by oral tradition first, instead of by the written Word; for he has confidence in the Divine Providence that was in the formation of the letter of Divine Revelation in order that it might surely be a fitting vessel for a continuous spiritual meaning. He has no doubt that the Jesus there presented is the historic Christ and that the miracles and the supernatural dogma were real accompaniments of the Divine incarnation; for they were in accordance with the fixed order of influx from the spiritual into the natural world. The trouble with the leaders of the church to-day, in both its conservative and its liberal branches, is the loss of belief in the Divinity of the Lord Jesus, and the substitution of a theory of evolution of the Divine in all humanity. So Dr. Anderson, who seems to rejoice in the collapse of liberal Christianity and in the confirmation of the faith in the Christ which the Church has always held in the past, is ready to give up belief in the historic Jesus as the Son of God because the miraculous element, so intimately blended with His life and teachings, present insurmountable difficulties to the scientific and critical mind of the West. We read: —

Suppose we say that Christianity was not "founded" by a single historical person, but was the synthesis of the factors that controlled the historical development of the time; that it was no new thing in the world, but the issue of the advance of the world for many centuries before the Christian era. On this supposition, what we have in Christianity is what had been long growing in the world — in Greece, in Rome, in Jewry. . . . As the truth of Christianity does not depend upon the supernaturalism of its origin, so it does not depend upon the perfection of its origin. It is of little purpose to discard the ordinary supernaturalism of the Church if Jesus is left uniquely perfect. We might as well

say that He was virgin-born and spent His life working miracles. If Jesus is left uniquely perfect it matters little by what method the feat is accomplished. (*Ibid.*, p. 305.)

The difficulty is met, by this writer, with the hypothesis that Christianity began, "not with a Jesus whom the early Christians were endeavoring to imitate, but with a Christ whom they worshipped." Thus the Christ is the product of the Church, or Christianity, instead of the Church and Christianity the product of Christ. The Christ of the Gospels is not Jesus but the ideals of humanity formed through the ages of evolution that culminated in Christianity. Christianity is not the worship of Jesus as the Son of God, but the worship of its own ideals of what God should be when made manifest. Thus, the hypothesis is that God has revealed Himself to humanity by means of its own idealizing faculty.

This is the position taken by Professor Foster of the University of Chicago in his recent book, "The Function of Religion in Man's Struggle for Existence" (*NEW-CHURCH REVIEW*, Vol. XVII, p. 155), but it does not go so far as to adopt the pantheism of that book. Dr. Gordon also seems to be moving in this direction in his last book, "Religion and Miracle," which is noticed in the Current Literature of this number of the *REVIEW*; for he seems ready to give up all the miraculous and supernatural events in the Bible as, not impossible, but improbable and unverifiable. And Dr. William Newton Clarke, in his book, "Sixty Years with the Bible," also noticed in this number of the *REVIEW*, does not entirely escape this tendency when answering the question, "What is the Bible?" he says, "The simple fact is that under a variety of motives the Church, Jewish and Christian, gathered up the precious memorials of her faith, and here they are." (p. 239.)

Now while Dr. Clarke seems to have no thought of giving up the historicity of the Bible, he does admit that the letter is often fallible in this respect. Perhaps Dr. Anderson is not going so very much farther in maintaining from Dr. James Denney's book, "Jesus and the Gospels," that the letter is altogether fallible as a history of Jesus, and is purely the Church's gathering up of "the precious memorials of her faith" in her own Christ, her ideal of God revealed.

At the present time there seems to be a strong repugnance on the part of the higher criticism to accepting the Divinity of Jesus because modern science makes it difficult to believe in the miraculous and supernatural conception and life of the Son of God. Is it not of

Divine Providence, then, that this problem may be left aside for a time, and that this hypothesis should receive consideration; for it leaves the mind free to consider what the Gospels really teach concerning the Christ as Divine? Later on it may be possible, and we believe that it will then be the duty of the New Church, to show that Jesus was this Divine Christ, and still is, in His glorified Divine-Human nature, now one with the Father, and the only God of heaven and earth. With this thought of the ultimate use to be made of it, let us see the remarkable conclusion to which the higher criticism may lead with regard to the meaning of the Gospels concerning the Divinity of Christ. We read:—

Let it not be said that this position implies the denial that Jesus ever existed. It would be the height of folly for anyone to make such an assertion. No one can prove a negative, and certainly no one can prove a negative such as this. . . . What is maintained is that the picture of the central figure of the Gospels is not that of a human being such as Liberal Christianity requires; that what has been frequently urged by the believers in the Divinity of Christ, that the figure of the Gospels cannot be brought into the human category, is true. He never manifests contrition, shows no evidence of the consciousness of sin, never asks forgiveness either of God or man. His attitude and relation to God was something radically different from that which, by the very nature of things, is possible to us. (See Principal Forsyth in the *Expository Times* for October, 1909). "He required of men a faith He never exercised. He sees God, knows God, hears God, but He never believes in God as He taught and enabled men to do. From Him the confession of sin and of faith are alike absent. Where we believe, He knew. Revelation was one process for Him; it is another for us. We find God in our experience, but God was His. For us God emerges in our self-consciousness; for Him God was His self-consciousness." All this bears out the contention of Dr. James Denney, . . . that the strictest criticism of the Gospels does not give us a human Jesus, but a Divine Christ. . . . What is called the human features of the Gospel story may be pointed out, how Jesus walked the cornfields with His disciples, how He blessed little children. Yes, but no human being in any cornfield ever talked as Jesus is represented as doing. "I say unto you that in this place is One greater than the Temple. The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." The Gospel of John has been set aside because the utterances put into the mouth of Jesus, "I am the Bread of Life. I am the Door; I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me," could not have been spoken by a human being. They are, it is maintained, the utterances of the Logos, the Eternal Word of God. A similar conclusion must be drawn from the utterances in the cornfield. (pp. 309, 310.)

As the Christ of the New Testament is not a human person, but a Divine Saviour, the Son of God, the Conqueror of Death and Satan, the Worker of Miracles, the Giver of Life, and the Revealer of Immortality, so the essence of Christianity is no mere message of love to God and man delivered by a human

teacher, it is what the Christian Church has all along declared it to be, a drama of redemption: its essential principle lies in the death and resurrection of the Christ. (pp. 313, 314.)

What is plain is that the death and resurrection on which the early Church fixed its faith was not that of a human teacher merely, but that of a God. (p. 315.)

And now what result is looked for? A symbolic use of the Gospels. Not that which is enjoyed in the New Church by means of a knowledge of the correspondences of natural things with spiritual, the key to the Divine style in which the Word of God is written, but something which seems to approach it and prepare the way for it. We read in conclusion: —

In all ages of the Church, and in all branches of it, it has been taught that historical faith is not vital faith. What signifies the birth of Jesus if the Christ be not born within the soul? What signifies the life of Jesus if the Christ-life be not reproduced in the life of the Christian? What signifies the death of Jesus if the soul does not die to sin? And what signifies the resurrection of Jesus if the soul does not rise from the grave of selfishness into newness of life?

What is needed is not the discarding of the symbolism of the ages — the death and resurrection of Christ. . . . No new Gospel is necessary or possible, but a new interpretation of the old Gospel. Behind all the symbols and forms and dogmas of the past, which the present is criticising, are visions of eternal beauty and truth which the world will never outgrow. (p. 317.)

H. C. H.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN THOUGHT.

MODERN thought has moulded Christianity into new forms. Many traditional views and doctrines, once held prominent or central, have been either cast aside, or radically altered in interpretation. The "Historicity of the Gospels," the "Incarnation," the "Atonement," are instances. The Gospels have come to be regarded as in large part legendary, and the story of the "Incarnation" as a myth or a symbol, while the legalistic view of the "Atonement" has been abandoned for a more moral and spiritual view. With these changes, the question arises whether Christianity in its very essence has not suffered transformation, and such a transformation that in modern thought historic Christianity is no longer accepted. Without undertaking to characterize as good or bad, right or wrong, the changes that have taken place; and without expressing any opinion as to whether the Christianity of to-day is or is not an improvement

upon that of the past; it may be said, as a simple fact, that modern thought is deliberately and decidedly averse to the doctrine that Christ is God. Such a statement is entirely foreign to the present-day philosophy of religion. You may find admirable statements in Professor Royce, in Dr. Wm. Newton Clarke, in Prof. Daniel Evans, of Christ's unique divinity, if you choose to use the word. Christ the interpreter and revealer of God is presented in the strongest terms. Christ as the indwelling presence and power of God in human life is set forth in a most worthy and helpful way. But the idea of Christ as the one God, the sole object of worship, is so remote from the thoughts of such men that it is not even dignified with explicit denial and rejection. When we cite the language of Thomas, "My Lord and My God" (JOHN XX, 28), and point to the acceptance by Jesus of the address and title, we are confidently reminded that this is an instance of mythical intrusion. In view of this attitude it is necessary to insist that the Gospel record shall not be corrected in the interest of uncertain textual criticism or of premature philosophies. Christianity cannot in good faith discredit the record upon which it is founded. In any case Christianity and the Founder of Christianity must share the fate of the record together. Christianity without Christ is delusion which honest and clear conviction should not tolerate. It may be said with truth that Christianity has never been entirely faithful to its Founder. The Church has wavered in doubt and uncertainty about its fundamental doctrine. It never has been able to frame a consistent doctrine about Christ's divinity. But one thing is certain, Christianity must in the end rest upon the fact that Christ is God.

As a matter of history, Swedenborg for the first time declared the doctrine that Christ is God in simple and direct terms. He also announced a system of interpretation of the Old and New Testaments which shows that this doctrine is the central feature of Biblical revelations. Christian history must be taken as the witness to this fact. Christian experience must be interpreted to mean that in Christ dwells "all the fulness of the God-head bodily." The doctrine which asserts this calls for explanation, and if the explanation is forthcoming Christianity will at last take on its true character. But if the modern world finds this doctrine unintelligible and inconsistent with its fundamental thought, Christianity as a distinctive form of religion will give place to some acceptable form of theism. Christianity cannot rest securely and permanently upon a mythical Christ any

more than it can on a mythical record. If modern thought ever comes to the definite conclusion that Christ was a natural man, then his character as Interpreter, Revealer, and Medium of God to men will fade, and in time He will be consigned to the class of teachers and prophets of old who did well their parts in their own day; but the world will look to new teachers and prophets for the coming day. It is the plain truth that if the Christian record is deprived of its matter of fact character and if the specific claims of the historic Christ be denied, there is left nothing but a legendary episode, and men will soon learn to look elsewhere for the explanation of Christian history and Christian experience; and they will find it in the proper endowments of mankind rather than in the transmissive powers of the man Jesus. The perfunctory laudation of "Jesus," now so common, will cease to be called for, and the religious world will settle down to a frank and quiet abandonment of all distinctively Christian professions. It is vain to expect the modern world to perpetuate Christian tradition when that tradition is believed to rest on a fictitious basis, however noble the fiction may have been regarded in past ages. It is simply impossible to express the true and full character of the historic Christ in terms of revealer, interpreter, and medium, however exalted the representation of these functions may be. It is a violation of Christian faith to suppose that Christ performed his part once for all and then passed from the world's stage, however perfectly we may conceive the part to have been performed. Christianity must have a present, living Christ, who now and evermore fills the Christian life with love, light, and power from his own proper being. It is his life alone which constitutes the essence of Christianity and is Christianity's Divine Source. If the ultimate explanation of Christian history and Christian experience be made to rest in God conceived as other than and superior to Christ, then the world will learn to get along without the mediator and go directly to the prime Source. When this has come to pass, Christianity will have disappeared from off the face of the earth. All the functions of revealer and interpreter will be ascribed directly to God Himself, who will give Himself immediately to men with all possible fulness. This is even now the truth with many of the best representatives of religion in some educated circles. It is, however, not the truth for the Christian mind in general. On the contrary there is much genuine worship of the Lord Jesus Christ and much genuine experience of His divine saving and regenerating power among

Christians of all denominations. For such, the Christian record is both fact and spirit, and the historic Christ is not merely the image, but He is the being of God, — is evermore the actual living God with whom they have to do. With such, Christianity is real, though imperfect. The Christian doctrine is not clear to them, but the Christian life is certain. On this basis we believe the religion of the future will rest. This belief is supported by the fact that there is now made known to the world a doctrine of God which justifies the worship of Christ and proclaims him to be the one and only God.

As a matter of fact, Swedenborg for the first time declared the doctrine Christ is God, in simple and direct terms. He also announced a system of interpretation of the Old and New Testaments which shows that this doctrine is the central feature of Biblical revelation. His exposition of the doctrine in the light of that revelation awaits the judgment of mankind. In the meantime, it is simple historic truth to say that the doctrine of the New Jerusalem, as contained specifically in the book of Revelation spiritually interpreted, is the only Christian doctrine properly speaking; for it alone keeps the Christian Scriptures intact and gives to Christ His proper character. Whatever the difficulties about this doctrine, metaphysical or theological, it must, in fidelity to Christian profession, be maintained. The Christian record, the Christian faith, and Christian worship, unite in proclaiming the supreme and sole Lordship of Christ. It is not enough to say that Christ was the unique and complete manifestation of God to men, for this does not directly and squarely cover the issue between one person and two. Even the doctrine of eternal sonship is inadequate to express the fact. There is in the object of Christian worship a unique and complete union of the human and the Divine; and it is a union in one person. By the record we must affirm that it was Jehovah himself, the very God, who bowed the heavens and came down, and who took upon himself man's fallen nature in the person of Jesus Christ. "I, Jehovah am thy Saviour." "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." The thought that is contained in these sentences unifies the Christian Scriptures and expresses the Christian faith. This thought undoubtedly encounters many difficulties in the text of Scripture; but it is the only victorious thought, and the only thought which preserves intact the Christian character of the Scriptures. The Christian faith is not satisfied with declaring

that Christ pre-existed eternally as a distinct person of the trinity, or even as the Logos, the Divine Wisdom. It must assert that Jehovah God in his fulness became man in Christ. It may go on to particularize and say that in the person of Christ the human and the Divine co-existed from the first, the moment of conception, to the last, the final ascension. If we want a form in which to think this doctrine we may make use of what modern psychology teaches about multiple personality. We may say that in the person of Christ from the first there were two centers of consciousness, the one human, and the other Divine. At first the human was dimly conscious of the Divine, but the Divine was fully conscious of the human. The human became more and more fully conscious of the Divine and the Divine more and more fully present in the human; until in the end they were reciprocally and completely united within the one person of Christ who was thereafter, after the ascension, the Divine in human form, the proper and sole object of Christian worship, the Source of all Christian life and experience in mankind. If any one is staggered by this assertion and asks, what can be meant by saying that the human was made Divine, and how man can be the infinite and perfect God? the answer is that it seems quite natural in our own experience to pass from the finite to the infinite. The human mind is by nature capable of making innumerable infinities. Witness a very simple illustration in the development of the number system. The truth is, the character of infinity inheres in the very nature of self-consciousness, as Professor Royce has so brilliantly exemplified in his "Supplementary Essay" to "The World and the Individual." In other words, God is man in the sense of being perfect man; and we are men by virtue of being images and likenesses of God. God is actually infinite and perfect. We are not, though being what we are, we may conceive of what it is to be infinite and perfect. By virtue of our relation to the Infinite we have a capacity for indefinite development. It seems then that there is no inherent or specific impossibility about conceiving of Christ as God. The characters of omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence are as easy to conceive of in the person of Christ as in the person of God other than Christ. These are the specific properties of divine love and wisdom, which are the essence of personality.

Swedenborg's system of interpretation and his doctrine of the Lord have not yet been passed upon by the world, for the world has not as yet given fair consideration to either. But many minds of high

order, and of very various type, have accepted both, and this acceptance means, so far, a genuinely new form of Christianity which is without qualification Christian in the most unreserved sense. A student of Swedenborg sees no more difficulty in conceiving of God in the person of Christ than in the form of the absolute. The characters of Infinite Love, Wisdom, and Power, involving moral perfection, must in any case be thought of as constituting personality; and Swedenborg's doctrine of the "Glorification" describes the process by which the human and the Divine became united in the person of Christ; and therefore the person of Christ and the Divine Being are one and the same. Whatever mysteries inhere in this view are identical with those of any idea of God which undertakes to conceive of God as the Infinite and the Perfect. Swedenborg's doctrine of "Love" is the key to the moral perfection of God, and the doctrine of the "Infinite" is involved in the doctrine of "Love." It would seem, then, that Christianity, in the sense here maintained, and modern thought must come to terms, and that Swedenborg's doctrine of the "Divine Human" must bring about the reconciliation.

L. F. H.

PHILANTHROPIES OF MILLIONAIRES.

THE bill for the incorporation of the Rockefeller Foundation, introduced in the United States Senate at the request of John D. Rockefeller, has called forth a general discussion of the philanthropies of millionaires. It is the third instance in recent times of the dedication of a gigantic fortune to public benefactions. We have in mind the efforts of Andrew Carnegie to so dispose of his millions while he lives that he may not have, as he has termed it, "The disgrace of dying rich"; and the work of the widow of Russell Sage to make wise disposition of his fortune for the benefit of mankind; and now, the greatest of them all, this project of John D. Rockefeller to establish a perpetual trust of philanthropies in his name, and of his many millions. It is a trust in more senses than one, for it is not only a stewardship of charitable dispensations, but it is also a business trust for the management of one of the largest properties in the world, to be organized and carried on, doubtless, in like manner as that in which this prince of trust-makers has amassed this wealth. But no longer is it to be for personal advantage, for its object is stated in the bill as follows:—

To promote the well-being and advance the civilization of the peoples of the United States and its Territories and possessions and of foreign lands, in the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge, in the prevention of suffering, and in the promotion of any and all the elements of human progress.

At first sight it seems like a gift to the United States, but it is not so any more than any corporation is such a gift; for the officers appear to be appointed by the corporation itself, and are no more under the control of the United States than those of any other corporation. It is true that the public are intended to be the beneficiaries, but no more so and not differently from the beneficiaries of any other charity. Not differently from those of Mr. Carnegie's charities and of Mr. Rockefeller's previous charities, amounting in the former instance to \$162,000,000, and in the latter to \$123,304,000. These large amounts have been entrusted in the past to various institutions for management. But this great addition to Mr. Rockefeller's benefactions, probably at least \$300,000,000, will remain in the management of Mr. Rockefeller himself, and his son and associates.

The change, therefore, is not as great as might be supposed; for New-Churchmen are familiar with the truth that the greatest volume of every one's genuine charities is in his daily vocation or business, for so he performs the greatest uses for the benefit of society; and that helping the poor is only a little incident, what Swedenborg calls a benefaction of charity. A great corporation, like the Standard Oil Trust, although it is said to have no soul, still must perform a vast volume of uses for the benefit of humanity; for it gathers oil from various directions, prepares it for use in many forms, and distributes it in this country and abroad. This is a work of charity, in the truest sense of the word, so far as the external form of usefulness is concerned, whatever may be the motives of the officers and managers of the corporation. And a great army of men are thus provided with employment which enables them to feed and clothe themselves and their families. This is an inexpressibly higher form of charity than that which provides food and clothing without employment, and thus pauperizes the beneficiaries.

Now, instead of oil and its by-products, education and other forms of human improvement will be the business of Mr. Rockefeller's new corporation. This is an important use; but the oil business will still be needed. And the money necessary to carry on schools,

colleges, libraries, hospitals, churches, and so on, must come from the employment of men in industrial enterprises; hence, the capital now dedicated to this new philanthropic organization may never leave the treasuries of the Standard Oil Company; it is doubtful if it could be made to yield as large an income by investment elsewhere. So the great charity of providing employment which shall clothe and feed an industrial army of men and their families will not cease as long as the capital, \$300,000,000, invested in industrial properties, continues to exist.

Now the question arises whether it is better to have the schools, colleges, hospitals, and such institutions for the public welfare and human progress, provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, corporation, trust, or syndicate, rather than by the United States, the people themselves. In passing this bill the senate will be transferring to a few men a part of the function of educating, or assisting in the education and upbuilding of, the people — a function which is coming to be more and more clearly seen to belong to the nation itself. Thus the tendency to neglect, or at least not to rise to a prompt and full realization of, national duties and responsibilities, is illustrated. And just to this extent we shall suffer a kind of national pauperization.

The New York *Evening Journal* seems disposed to accept the situation in much the same spirit of gratitude that individuals show when others, in mistaken kindness, do for them that which they ought to do for themselves; we read: —

Think what you please of Rockefeller in the past. Describe as you please his business methods, his ruthlessness in competition. But remember that he at least is doing what the people haven't had the brains to do for themselves. He is taking national wealth and using it for the national welfare. He is transforming his streams of oil into colleges, books, and scientific laboratories. Where others find in money only added possibilities of stupid self-indulgence, Rockefeller prefers to find the force that spreads knowledge.

It may be well to note in passing that the income of the Rockefeller Foundation (\$300,000,000 at five per cent interest) may be estimated at \$15,000,000 a year, to be devoted to the education and improvement of humanity; while the appropriation of the United States Congress last year for the battle-ship race of the nations was \$135,000,000. And Secretary Meyer wanted an appropriation this year of \$18,000,000 to build a thirty-two thousand-ton

battle-ship to out-strip the world, in addition to the usual amount of expenditure for the navy. The cost of one battle-ship would establish fifty manual-training schools, teaching the rudiments of a trade to seventy-five thousand people a year. Help is not needed, from a Rockefeller Foundation, in view of such expenditures for an "armed peace," to provide for "the well-being and advance the civilization of the people of the United States."

Surely the world needs the New-Church doctrine of charity in its application to society as well as to the individual. The New York *Evening Journal* seems to be right in the conclusion that Mr. Rockefeller is wise enough to do for the people what they are not wise enough to do for themselves. And it is this lack of wisdom in the use of money, and of the opportunities of life which money represents, that, more than anything else, places a few men so far above their fellows in this respect, and creates the possibility and need of these philanthropies of millionaires. When the nation wastes its revenues in useless extravagance, and masses of individuals find in it only added possibilities of stupid self-indulgence, Carnegies and Rockefellers are needed to do for the nation what it should be doing for itself, and to do for industrial armies of individuals what they should be doing for themselves. But as fast as the New-Church doctrine of charity becomes known and practised, this need will cease; for then it will be seen that giving to the poor is not the true order of charity, for it only dwarfs a man to have that done for him which he should be doing for himself. The true order of charity is for every man to be useful to all the rest of his fellow creatures, or society; to do what is right in every work and fulfil his duty in every office. It is for the employer to deal justly with every employee, paying him honest wages and providing as favorable conditions of work as possible; and for the employed to deal justly with his employer giving him faithful service. It is for every man to deal squarely with his competitor, never taking an unjust or dishonest advantage of him by which to "drive him to the wall" and get his business away from him. If combinations are formed, they should be to increase powers of usefulness, and never to conspire to rob the public. And the country should be loved and cherished as a mother to whom every man owes his life and opportunities. Will a man rob his mother? This fidelity to duty is the charity taught in the New Church and by the Christian religion properly understood. And

it has been taught so faithfully that few can be said to be ignorant of it as a theory. If it were practised generally, there would be no millionaires and no need of their benefactions; although there could be just as large combinations of capital for gigantic enterprises owned by many as there now are owned by few.

But there is something fearfully inconsistent in an order of things that creates great fortunes for the few by methods in which there is little if any genuine charity, and at the same time creates the need of alms-giving, or of a form of charity in which that needs to be done for others which they ought to be doing for themselves. There must be great spiritual loss in this for all concerned. Loss to those who have lived without charity in their business from day to day, for only so can spiritual character be formed which is the wealth and capital of eternal life. "If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches"? (LUKE xvi, 11.) And loss to those who are not able to do for themselves and others what they should be doing. Under such conditions the giving away of a fortune to the poor may seem to fulfil the Lord's requirement of the rich ruler, when He bade him go sell all that he had and give to the poor, and come, take up the cross and follow Him (MARK x, 21); but now that salvation is seen to consist in a life-long working out of character by an every-day charity in one's business, this fulfilment must seem quite external and superficial. And still, when one does this as soon as his eyes are opened to the truth about the matter, he is doing the best he can. And it is to be remembered that the Christian Church of the past did not teach this new doctrine of charity. It taught salvation by faith alone, and men were thus led to believe that methods of business were under no religious obligation, that they could do business heartlessly through the week and be saved if they believed in the atoning blood of the Saviour on the Sabbath. Indeed, it is to just this doctrine of faith without the works of charity, more than anything else, that we owe this dreadful inconsistency in our charities of to-day, especially with our millionaires.

H. C. H.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES.

THE LORD'S PRAYER (A SUGGESTION).*

THE object of this paper is to suggest that the New Church in her use of the Lord's Prayer return to the common version of the same, especially in the third petition thereof, which in our Books of Worship now reads, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so also in the earth," but which in future editions it is suggested may read, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

The writer believes that he voices the general sentiment of those who most constantly use the prayer when he asserts that the changes introduced into it by our spiritual fathers in the church several generations ago were a mistake, and that it would be wiser for us now, ere it be too late, to return to that form which English mothers have taught their children for so many centuries, namely, that taken from the Authorized Version of Matthew's Gospel, chapter vi, 9-13.

The present suggestion is not the result of any new or critical comparison of the original Greek with the several translations, or of any doubt of the more literal accuracy of the New-Church Version or of the Revised Version, which is nearly like it; it is simply an appeal for a more natural rendering according to English thought and speech, as well as one more in harmony with the rest of the Christian world in a point where divergence has been unnecessary. The change asked for is therefore not a mere matter of sentiment. The common version of the passage, while it does change a little the order of the words from that of the original, seems to the writer better English than the New-Church substitute, while it expresses the meaning as clearly and accurately. In the clause "Thy will be done on earth as [it is] in heaven," the phrase "on earth" [ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] adverbially belongs to the imperative "be done" [γενεθῆτω], and should therefore according to English usage be placed next to it, so that the two form the natural antecedent to the relative adverb [ὥς = "as"],

* This study was presented to the Council of Ministers in 1894. It is now offered to the readers of the REVIEW because the subject is likely to come up again for consideration at the next meeting of that body. — EDITORS.

shown to be such by the absence of the accent. Therefore every English child perceives the awkwardness of saying "Thy will be done, as in heaven so in earth" while it feels no incongruity in repeating "on earth as it is in heaven." The difference comes from the fact that the latter is the English idiom and the former the Greek. Every grammarian knows that the English language has no such wealth of particles as has the Greek with its "ὡς" and its "καί," or the Latin with its "*sicut*" and "*ita*." The modern tongue therefore cannot with impunity separate the protasis of a comparison into two parts and put the apodosis between them, however natural such a linguistic anomaly might be to those ancient tongues.

Every classical scholar knows, that, owing to the inflections, the Greek possesses greater variety and freedom in the order of words than is admissible in English where often the position of a word alone determines its relation to the others of a sentence. To illustrate this we could find no better example than the Lord's Prayer itself from beginning to end. In the original, of course, each word is in its proper and divinely appointed place; but in rendering it into English the translator is compelled to change this order in order to make any sense at all. Necessity therefore becomes a privilege and most wisely did the translators of King James's time use it, in this as well as other parts of the Holy Book. To illustrate this point let us take a few sentences from the prayer giving the Greek order of the words, and we shall see how necessary was some change in nearly every sentence and clause:—

ΠΑΤΕΡ ἡμῶν ὃ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,

PATER hemon ho en tois ouranois,

FATHER of-us the in the heavens,

ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου.

hagiastheto to onoma sou.

Hallowed be the name of-thee.

Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.

Eltheto he basileia sou.

Let-come the kingdom of-thee;

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

genetheto to thelema sou, hos en ourano, kai epi tes ges.

Be-done the will of-thee, as in heaven, so on the earth.

Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.

Ton arton hemon ton epiousion dos hemin semeron.

The bread of-us the daily give to-us to-day.

It will be observed that in every one of the petitions quoted the order of subject and predicate is reversed in the translation from what it is in the original, and that this is done to make good English. In the last clause quoted the Greek order quite properly and very effectively places the emphatic word "bread" at the beginning, although it is an objective case, while the translators with proper regard for the English idiom have felt it necessary to reverse the whole sentence reading it backwards as it were.

Wherefore then should not the same liberty be claimed and allowed in the clause which immediately precedes? The writer, for one, does not believe that the phrase "as in heaven so in earth" of the Revisers will ever become popular, as opposed to "on earth as [it is] in heaven" of King James's translation. He therefore thinks it would be wise in the New Church to return to the latter and thus into loving conformity with the rest of the Christian world. Such a step would also help to render this Divine Prayer again, what it once was, "the simplest form of speech that infant lips can try."

PHILIP B. CABELL.

THE PRODIGAL SON.

LUKE XV, 11-32.

WITH what tenderness the Lord has given this parable of youthful waywardness, sin, and repentance. How different was this merry-making from that which the youth had sought in leaving his home. And yet how deep and peaceful must have been the enjoyment after what he had passed through. He had seen the world; he had tasted the cup of its pleasures even to the dregs, and had found them bitter. From the far country to which his restless desires had led him — a country far removed from his father's love and the peaceful innocence of his childhood — had he come; from feeding hungry swine, and hungering himself for a better life, had he returned.

The going away may not have been as sudden as it seemed. Men do not go suddenly into evil. Gradually, for months, perhaps years, he had been leaving the innocent affections which the heavenly Father bestows upon all in childhood — the love for his father and brother which made home sweeter and dearer than all else. He went away from home in spirit, in thought and affection, before he took the

corresponding steps in the flesh. A love of himself and of his own worth and importance had gradually been covering up and shutting in the child's innocent love for, and trust in and dependence upon, his father. The happiness of sharing his father's life and property in the home, had been left behind, before he asked for his portion of the inheritance, and went out into the world to try his fortune.

He was not aware, we may believe, of this change going on in himself; he did not realize how unworthy of his father's house it was making him; he did not observe how this change of heart from the home to the world was the cause of the corresponding change in outward relations. It was the operation of the law of correspondence between mind and matter, the spiritual and the natural, to which Swedenborg calls attention, and in accordance with which he shows the Sacred Scriptures to be written. The cause of every change in the natural world always exists in a corresponding change in the spiritual. The young man of the parable did not know how unworthy he had become, until he went out into the world and did that which was in his mind and heart. Then he knew to his shame, and every one else knew. It must have been a great surprise. But such surprises are not unknown to us. The Lord in His wise Providence permits the evils of the mind to find expression in the conduct whenever it is necessary to help men to come to themselves, to know themselves, and through repentance come home to Him.

Young men often long for their freedom, as did the youth of the parable. Home must always seem a constraint after the heart has left it. What a feeling of freedom must have come at last as this youth took his heritage into his own hands and went forth into the world. But was he free? Yes, he was free to go, but not to stay. He must leave his home, not because his father sent him away but because his own restless desires drove him out. He was an outcast already and did not know it. He was a slave and did not realize it until, under that cruel compulsion, he had wasted his substance in riotous living. Then, in the poverty, hunger, and shame to which he had been driven, he felt the compulsion and found it cruel; he was compelled to feed swine literally as he had been doing spiritually in his riotous living. The correspondence between the spirit and the flesh was completed. The swine were literally his masters and he their servant; as the selfish and swinish affections in his own heart, to which they correspond, had been his masters and wrought

his ruin. What wonder, when the Lord was casting out a legion of evil spirits from the poor man haunting the tombs at Gadara, that they begged permission to enter a herd of swine, and that the swine rushed down a steep place into the sea; and after that the man sat at the Lord's feet, clothed, and in his right mind. (MARK v.)

So the youth of the parable at the end of his long journey from home, came to himself — a swineherd, a servant of swine. Was he free? He knew the truth at last; and the Lord said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Such was the revelation of the lower nature to the young man. But it was made to his higher nature, wherein was buried the innocence of his childhood, and it awoke a strong revulsion and abhorrence.

When he came to this higher self he came to the true son of his father; he came to tender memories of the home and the family. From the disorder and shame of his present condition he lifted up his eyes to a vision of the order, peace, usefulness, happiness, and beauty of his father's house; and appreciating at length the satisfactions of such a life, he thought, "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger!" (verse 17.) Is it not like the Psalmist's cry, saying, "A day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness"? (PSALM lxxxiv, 10.)

This is what he had wasted in riotous living, the substance of that home; the substance of that domestic love, and orderly, useful, happy life. The higher nature now saw this clearly, justly, sorrowfully; saw that his share in it was gone, but nevertheless a decision was reached by Divine help, saying, "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants." (verses 18, 19.)

Confidence in himself and his own worthiness, a high opinion of himself, sent him away from home; a realization of his unworthiness, humility brought him back.

"I will arise." How much that means to the spirit! The world would call it a descent into repentance and humiliation; but it is, nevertheless, an ascent from the lower to the higher nature, from the swineherd to the son. He arose, and the lost was found; the dead was alive again.

The parable is transparent; its spiritual meaning shines through that of the letter; its purpose is to teach us of the heavenly Father's love ever seeking the lost. Hence the two parables which introduce it, that of the "Lost Sheep" and that of the "Lost Coin," close with the refrain, "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons which need no repentance." (verse 7.)

The elder brother is a representative of the ninety and nine. He could not come into the feast, he could not share in this heavenly rejoicing, because he had confidence in his own righteousness; like his younger brother in the beginning he was thinking of his own worthiness and of what belonged to him.

Selfishness shuts out the Father's love which gives heaven its joy. It may act equally in either of two directions: it may become a passion for spending all upon self, as in the younger son; or it may become a passion for saving all for self as in the elder. It may reach beyond saving money to saving reputation, honor, influence, selfishly. This makes the Pharisee. Thinking of himself and of what belonged to him, the elder brother replied to his father entreating him to come into the spirit of rejoicing over the recovery of his brother: —

Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine: and yet thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends; but when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. (verses 29, 30.)

From the selfish point of view this does seem hard, to one who serves for pay it seems unjust. But the selfishness of the world does not make the worthiness of heaven. "Son all that is mine is thine." All was at the service of his sons. But the elder was ready to receive only the blessings of selfishness. He could not enjoy the fatted calf unless it was killed for the one he loved, — not his brother, but himself.

But this is not what the fatted calf means in the Scriptures; it is not what it corresponds with in human hearts. It is what the golden calf, the idol, meant to the Israelites in the wilderness, when they were willing to receive the Ten Commandments on the stone tables as a covenant of selfishness. They were ready to serve the Lord in obedience to them for selfish rewards in earthly blessings.

It is easy to see that the swine, in the Scriptures represent the selfish and vile desires of men. And when we think of the patient obedience with which oxen submit to the yoke and cows yield their milk we shall see that they correspond with a humble desire to be useful, to serve and give comfort to others, in every helpful way pouring out "the milk of human kindness." And as the young of every kind represent innocence, the fatted calf represents the beginning of this desire to serve in innocence; that is, for the sake of serving, and without thoughts of selfish returns.

Because this spirit, through suffering and a realization of unworthiness, is shown in the younger son, he is no longer a servant of swine; and it is only bringing external conditions into correspondence with internal for his father to exclaim: —

Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet, and bring the fatted calf and kill it, and let us eat and make merry; for this my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found.

Blessed is he who thus loves to serve, in innocence of spirit, from the pure love of doing right, in obedience to the Lord our heavenly Father.

H. C. H.

HISTORICA; VERA HISTORICA; HISTORICA FACTA.

THESE are Swedenborg's terms in description of the general style, and of an early difference in the style, of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 66), of the historical portions of Daniel and Jonah (*Ibid.*, n. 1709), and presumably of any other books in the Bible that are historical in whole or in part. *Historica* is his term for this style generally. By *vera historica* he describes narrative of events that actually took place; by *historica facta* what appears to be historical narrative, and yet is descriptive of no actual event so far as the literal sense goes, but, under mere historical form, is a record of spiritual development and degeneration; the most notable example of this made-up history being the early chapters of Genesis to the mention of Eber in the eleventh (*Ibid.*, n. 1020). The terminology goes unchanged by the fact that in GEN. x and xi this composed history and actual history are interwoven (*Ibid.*, n. 1140).

It is not aside from our purpose to note here, in passing, that in either phrase the term *historica* is used advisedly by Swedenborg to mean, strictly, historical data, and fragmentary historical data, inasmuch as Scripture history is select and the spiritual sense selective (*Ibid.*, n. 1468e).

It may be seriously questioned whether the term *vera historica* is not often made to do more than describe the style of the books enumerated above. To many the phrase apparently implies the historical accuracy of those books. Much has been written, by different students of Swedenborg's use of the term, on the veracity of Scripture history and on the historical truth of the Scriptures (*Intellectual Repository* for 1830-31, p. 281; *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, Vol. XV, p. 599 [1891]; *New-Church Messenger*, June 1, 1904; *New-Church Review*, Vol. XII, p. 137 [1905]; Vol. XIV, p. 22 [1907]), and in more than one of these articles the historical accuracy of the Scriptures has been at least implicitly asserted, while in the one cited from the *New-Church Messenger* that phrase is expressly used. Certainly it is only this implication in the articles that could have provoked from an "English friend" the letter which is noted in the fourth article cited above, and the objections in which lodge, not against the fact that the books enumerated above narrate what actually took place, but against the implicit assertion that their narration is accurate and exact. On this distinction the "English friend" himself is not clear, for he adduces his objections as if they were in a class with JOSH. x, 12, 13 (Apocalypse Explained, n. 401(18)). This passage, however, Swedenborg excepts from the description of Joshua as *vera historica*, not because it is not accurate history, but simply because it is not history at all, save for the fact of Joshua's quotation of it from the Book of Jasher, where it was prophecy (*Ibid.*). But the other objections which the "English friend" presses in his letter are to the point of the implicitly asserted historical accuracy of the Scriptures. The incident in NUMB. xxii, 22 *sq.*, where it is said that Balaam's ass spoke, is strictly directed to this assertion. (That the assertion amounts to the bestowal on Scripture narrative of a certain Divine accuracy and historical infallibility is evident from a declaration in the article last cited above, that to take the stand the author does "is to say with the Psalm, 'Thy law is truth.'") Swedenborg himself declares that it was not the ass that spoke (*Ibid.*, n. 140(5)); yet the Scripture narrative is clearly to that effect. This does not

mean that NUMB. xxii, 22, *sq.* is not *vera historica*, but that the passage is not exact fact, rather a record, as Swedenborg says, "according to the appearance." In similar ways the correspondent's other objections hold good (1 KINGS vii, 23, *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 5291(10); MATT. xxvii, 52, 53, *Ibid.*, n. 9229; MATT. iv, 5, 8, *Ibid.*, n. 1663(2)). There are still other passages that militate against the assertion of historical accuracy for the Scriptures. Probably the differences in the accounts in Joshua and Judges of the settlement of Canaan are largely irreconcilable. Certainly when the question is carried over into the New Testament, into the variations of the Synoptic Gospels from one another, and of the fourth Gospel from the three, the student cannot insist on strict historical accuracy, down, for instance, to chronological order, or to exact quotation of utterances of the Lord. The "English friend" remarks, carefully, that the instances he has adduced may not be all; "it is a point that seems to me to be in suspense, not settled, and yet worthy of considerably more light."

The interpretation of *vera historica* as "true history" in the sense of accurate history has come, in part, from two contrasts which Swedenborg strikes that overdrive the meaning of the term. Very often, as over against the spiritual significance of the narrative, he insists carefully and emphatically on the historical truth, as well, of the narrative. To meet his times, when liberalism had reigned so long, he was always exceedingly careful not to invalidate the literal sense of the Scriptures when he expounded the spiritual: he insisted always that although the historical narrative was, as he said, representative and symbolical, at the same time, approximately from GEN. xii on, excepting Josh. x, 12, 13, it related fact. In the contrast (*Arcana Cœlestia*, nn. 66, 1403, 1404, 1678, 1709), the latter statement is easily overdriven to imply the accuracy of the relation, whereas it asserts only the actual occurrence of the events related. Again Swedenborg spared no means of contrast in differencing *vera historica* and *historica facta*, but made it so emphatic that GEN. i-ix is a piece of writing historical in nothing but form, while GEN. xii on is historical as well in content, that the contrast may possibly suggest at times the implication that in GEN. xii-1, Exodus, and the other books, history is accurately set down. And this implication seems to be expressly warranted by Swedenborg's very first statement on the subject in the translated "*Arcana Cœlestia*," n. 66: that

in the historical books the "facts are just as they appear in the sense of the letter" (Library Edition). In the old N. Y. edition the sentence is translated free from the implication: "The historical facts actually occurred as they are related in the letter." The Latin certainly, is entirely free from it: "*Historica talia prorsus sunt, qualia in sensu literæ comparent.*"

In part, too, the inference of historical accuracy has resulted from a not infrequent recital of details by Swedenborg as "true historicals" severally. In "Arcana Cœlestia," nn. 1468, 1709, 1783, he recounts the minute details of some Scripture passages as "true historicals," and they are such details as would give accuracy to the narration; but obviously enough from the context, he does this in every instance merely to drive home the fact that Scripture history, despite its possession of a pervasive spiritual meaning, still narrates actual occurrence, too, in the literal sense. How accurately, he nowhere undertakes to say.

Swedenborg's own simple definition of *vera historica* occurs not seldom. See, for example, "Arcana Cœlestia," nn. 755(4) and 2135. According to the latter paragraph *vera historica* are such as "describe what really took place." That the description is exact is neither added nor implied; often in fact, the intimation is that it is not exact (*infra*). The contrasts alone in which the term appears — either the contrast of the historical with the symbolical character of the letter, sharpened sometimes by a recital of historical details, or the contrast of actual with made-up history — it is these contrasts that seem chiefly responsible for the heightened and unintended meaning given by some to *vera historica*.

For, in the first place, the accuracy of Scripture history is a superfluity in Swedenborg's view of the Bible. There is no indication anywhere in the doctrines that inaccurate historical relation cannot serve the purposes of revelation and convey its spiritual truth as well as accurate. Of the contrary there is more than suggestion. Wholly fictitious history (GEN. i-ix) serves that purpose. The very inter-variations of the Gospels not only conform to the purposes, circumstances, and capacities of the writers, but they also convey differences of spiritual meaning. In general, historical sequence is disregarded in the Word by force of the exigencies of the spiritual sense of the Scriptures (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1753(2)). And of the dominance of the spiritual sense over the matter and manner of the letter,

not inconceivably to historical inaccuracy in the latter, as for common example, in the case of significative numbers (*Ibid.*, nn. 2959(2), 5291(10)), we could have no statement of more universal application than this that occurs at the end of "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 1468: "No other historicals are recorded in the Word, and in no other order, and no other words are used to express them, than such as in the internal sense may express" the arcana of that sense.

In the second place, the historicity, certainly the historical accuracy of the literal Scripture, is not a subject of revelation but of human research. The writer in the *Intellectual Repository* for 1830-31, p. 281, says of Swedenborg's statement of the historicity of GEN. xii on, "If then we believe him (Swedenborg) to have been Divinely illuminated to deliver the doctrine of the New Church, we must allow this (that statement) to be the doctrine of the New Church on the subject." But GEN. i-xi Swedenborg knew was only fictitious history from revelation (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 11(2); Spiritual Diary, n. 6107), that it was a portion of the Ancient Word which was partly so composed; GEN. xii on, with the other books, he took for historical relation of actual events as scholars did then, and for the most part, do now. Revelation could hardly illumine him to see historical accuracy where it had not in the beginning required historical accuracy but such historical narrative only, often partial, as adequately expressed its spiritual truth (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1468e). The historical accuracy of the Scripture narratives is no more in the province of revelation than is the not wholly unrelated question of manuscript authority; on that Swedenborg does not attempt to pass (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 95e). Of course the great mass of Scripture narrative relates actual occurrence; but that is a fact established not by revelation, whose subject is spiritual fact and truth, but by natural research in general, by the findings of archæology and by the testimony of secular history to the same events.

Vera historica and *historica facta* are Swedenborg's terms when he comes to designate two kinds of historical composition in the Scriptures — and this in a very general and non-literary way, merely for the purposes of spiritual interpretation. He speaks indiscriminately of GEN. i-xi, and of GEN. xii-l, of Exodus, and of the other books, as *historica* (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3665(5)). Then he distinguishes GEN. i-xi (to the mention only of Eber in the last chapter) as *historica facta* (*Ibid.*, nn. 66, 482, 1020, 1283); in GEN. x and xi,

he adds, *vera historica* mingle with *facta* (*Ibid.*, n. 1140) and he calls the style "intermediate"; the rest of Genesis and the historical books generally (the remainder of the Pentateuch, and Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings: — *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 66), as well as the historical portions of Daniel and Jonah (*Ibid.*, n. 1709), he calls *vera historica*, pointing out, however (*Apocalypse Explained*, n. 401(18)) that JOSH. x, 12, 13, is not *vera historica* but prophecy out of the Book of Jasher. By *vera historica* he means narrative relating, albeit with slight and infrequent inaccuracy, actual events, events that actually took place; by *historica facta*, what appears in the form of historical narrative, yet is descriptive of no actual event so far as the literal sense goes, but, under the figures of composed history, details spiritual fact, development or degeneration. Regarding the accuracy of the truly historical narrative Swedenborg makes no direct statement; his statements about the relation of the literal sense to the spiritual and about the former's function imply, however, the entire possibility of literal and historical inaccuracy. Without a doubt the assertion of historical accuracy for the Scriptures is superfluous to his doctrine concerning them; and the whole question is really out of his province as revelator.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

THE NEW-CHURCH QUARTERLY.*

WE welcome this new journal in the field of our Church publications, and we welcome its declared purpose of "stimulating the study and application to human life of New-Church truth in all its aspects and of promoting a definite and vigorous New-Churchmanship."

The first number, January, 1910, is before us. It is attractive in appearance and well printed. The table of contents and the several departments present an inviting list of topics. The editor is the Rev. James F. Buss, who is well known and distinguished for his vigorous presentation of New-Church doctrine. There is also an advisory board consisting of the Rev. W. A. Presland and Messrs. J. Howard Spalding and David Wynter.

The editor in his "Inaugural Statement" sets forth the aims of the *Quarterly* and lays stress on the vital importance of studying the writings as the guide in a truly New-Church life. This is followed by four articles covering a wide range of interest. The Rev. T. K. Payton, well known to the readers of the REVIEW as a valued contributor, has a doctrinal study entitled "The Inmost, Internal, and External Minds of the Lord and Man." "The Sociological Aspect of New-Church Truth" is the title of an article by Alf. J. Johnson. The next article by Chas. Wm. Ablett on Dr. François Joseph Gall, an interesting and valuable historical study, seems to have its place by virtue of Dr. Gall's epoch-making study of the brain in its psychological relations. An article entitled "A Systematic Philosophy and Theology of the New Church" by the late Rev. Dr. R. L. Tafel concludes the list. The Rev. W. A. Presland has a brief statement about "The Centenary of the Swedenborg Society." The department of "Reviews" contains a notice by the editor, on the whole favorable,

**The New-Church Quarterly*. Published for The New-Church Quarterly Publishing Association by JAMES SPEIRS. 1 Bloomsbury Street, W. C., London. 98 pp. Price 40 cents, postpaid.

of the "New-Church Translation of the Books of Samuel"; also one by Wm. A. Presland of Jonathan Robinson's "The Lord, Tempted, Risen, and Glorified; and other Essays." "Notes and Comments" and "Survey of the Quarter's Periodicals" are departments conducted by the editor and bear the impress of his positive and discriminating mind.

Altogether the *Quarterly* makes a good impression and seems destined to occupy an important field.

L. F. H.

THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN LIFE.*

THIS book is more than a masterly and illuminating statement of philosophical thought for twenty-three hundred years upon the problem of human life; it is an even-surfaced and well-polished mirror of the life and thought of our times; a piece of excellent work, soulful, beautiful, enjoyable.

The author is an idealist philosopher of three score years. He is a seer of wide and keen vision; a strong and sympathetic thinker; a close and deep student, and a master of forceful, clear and elegant writing.

One who knows Professor Eucken and his writings well, says,—

Nobody since Martineau has written more eloquently or thought more deeply concerning the reality of a super-sensual world, the inevitableness of a self-revelation of divine purpose to the human soul, the necessity of a spiritual rebirth through ethical endeavor, the freedom of man's moral personality, and its continuance beyond the limitations of space and time.†

This highly gifted, this physically and mentally robust teacher of philosophy, is qualified to speak to the serious and cultured thinkers of to-day upon this subject he has chosen; and through this book he is rendering a service to many who are endeavoring to know more fully the inner states and life movements of human nature and the needs of the present age. He is a brave and cheery spirit, a stimu-

* *The Problem of Human Life, as viewed by the Great Thinkers from Plato to the Present Time.* By RUDOLF EUCKEN, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Jena; awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1908. Translated from the German by Williston S. Hough and W. R. Boyce Gibson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. September, 1909; reprinted January 1910. 582 pp. \$3.00.

† *The Dial*, Jan. 16, 1909. Chicago.

lating guide, a helpful fellow-student, and a man whom hundreds who have enjoyed this famous work would be glad to know more intimately.

The translation seems to us to have been excellently done by Messrs. Hough and Gibson and to have well deserved the commendation bestowed upon it by the author. We hope that the work in this English presentation will have as wide and cordial a reception in North America as the original has had in Germany, where seven editions have already appeared.

The book consists of an "Introduction" and three parts: Part I, treating of "Hellenism"; Part II, of "Christianity"; and Part III, of "The Modern World."

We have read the "Introduction" again and again with pleasure and profit. This is its first paragraph: —

What does our life mean when viewed as a whole? What are the purposes it seeks to realize? What prospect of happiness does it hold out to us? To ask these questions is to set ourselves the problem of life; nor need we stay to justify our right to ask them. They force themselves on us to-day with resistless insistence. They are the cry of an age rent inwardly assunder; its heart at enmity with the work of its hands. The labor of the preceding centuries, nay, of the last few decades, has indeed been immeasurably fruitful. It has given birth to a new culture and to new views of the universe. But its triumphal progress has not implied a simultaneous advancement of the inward life; its dazzling victories have not been won for the spirit and substance of man. With relentless energy it has driven us more and more exclusively upon the world without us, subduing us to its necessities, pressing us more and more closely into the service of our environment. And the activities of our life ultimately determine our nature. If our powers are wholly concentrated on outward things and there is an ever-diminishing interest in the inner life, the soul inevitably suffers. Inflated with success, we yet find ourselves empty and poor. We have become the mere tools and instruments of an impersonal civilization which first uses us then forsakes us, the victims of a power as pitiless as it is inhuman, which rides rough-shod over nations and individuals alike, ruthless of life or death, knowing neither plan nor reason, void of all love or care for man.

Part I contains helpful preliminary remarks on the "Greek Character" and on the "Development of Hellenism," and a review of the three periods of this development: "those of intellectual creation, worldly wisdom, and religious meditation and speculation" — including in the first period Plato and Aristotle, whose philosophies are ably analyzed and contrasted, and in the second period, the Epicureans and the Stoics. This part concludes with a strong and

suggestive summary — "The Greatness and the Limitations of Antiquity."

Part II treats of the "Foundation of Christianity"; of "Early Christianity," and of "Modern Christianity." Under the first heading are given the general character of Christianity, and Jesus' view of life. Both these sections are of great value, and our space limit alone forbids our quoting portions of them. They show the position and attitude of many of the strongest and kindest minds of to-day in relation to Jesus and Christianity, and help us to compare and contrast this position and attitude more intelligently and sympathetically with the New Christianity's doctrine concerning the Lord Jesus Christ. Under the headings "Early Christianity" and "Modern Christianity" is given a history of Christianity, condensed into 127 pages. The treatment is broad, but it is vital and masterly.

Part III — "The Modern World" — has for its main divisions, "General Characteristics of the Modern World," "The Rise of the New World," and "The Breaking up of the Enlightenment" and the "Search for New Solutions." The second of these divisions is subdivided, I. "The Renaissance," II. "The Enlightenment." The third is subdivided, I. "Reactions against the Enlightenment in the Eighteenth Century," II. "German Idealism," III. "The Movement toward Realism," IV. "The Reaction against Realism," V. "The Present Situation." In this treatise on the "Modern World" and its great thinkers, so well done and by a master of the subject, the student of Swedenborg looks for and fails to find mention of the greatest philosopher and psychologist of recent centuries. And yet a close reading of this book has caused the feeling that the author has become acquainted directly or indirectly with the thought and doctrines of the Swedish seer. We think that our professor must know the writings of this great man. Then why this omission, why no mention of him and of his work? There cannot be a conspiracy of silence among the more spiritually minded of the learned of to-day with respect to the apostle of the New Christianity! Can it be that some of our foremost thinkers and teachers do not yet know how to take Swedenborg and do not yet know how to place him and his views and doctrines? Many students of Swedenborg think that he has more to offer to the open-minded toward a solution of the problem of our life than any other thinker of the "Modern World." And his doctrines of man and human life are broad and deep and full. We

are sorry for this omission. Feeling, as we do, a cordial respect and admiration for Professor Eucken as a thinker and a writer, we should be less than honest if we failed to state that his omission of Swedenborg seems to us a serious one. But having said this we feel free to commend the book to every studious New-Churchman. It is worthy the time and attention of the busiest. It is a book that no earnest student of our times, of the world's best thought, and of the problem of our life, can afford to pass unread.

PERCY BILLINGS.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD.*

THIS is a book which everyone who wishes to know what the Christian doctrine of God is should read. No abstract or summary could give even a slight impression of the wealth of thought, the breadth of view, and the catholicity of spirit, all so admirably expressed in the simplest and most direct everyday English. To say that a book on theology is readable is saying a great deal. To say that it is deeply interesting and vitally helpful is wholly unexpected.

The author "aims to show forth the doctrine as Christian faith may now receive it." He does this in the light of history and of the present day. The Old and New Testaments, the Church, and modern thought yield their treasures to his judicious handling. The result is a statement which may be fairly said to put the traditional Christian doctrine of God at its best, with one qualification to be mentioned later.

After the "Introduction," the subject is treated under the general heads of, I. God, II. God and Men, III. God and the Universe, IV. Evidence.

Of the historical arguments to prove God's existence we find bare mention. On the contrary such an attempt is deliberately set aside and actual Christian and human thought about God is simply noted, reported, and interpreted. The doctrine of God is derived from Christian experience, especially the experience of the Lord Jesus Christ, whose interpretation and revelation of God is accepted as wholly true and sufficient. So the treatment is religious, not phil-

**The Christian Doctrine of God.* By WM. NEWTON CLARKE, D. D., Professor in Colgate University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1909. 477 pp. 8vo. cloth. \$2.50 net.

osophical. It must not, however, be supposed from this that philosophical insight and competency are wanting, for intellectually the book moves at a high level. We forbear any attempt at exposition. The book has to be read to be appreciated. It would be purely arbitrary and misleading to select any of the special topics for commendation of the treatment. If one should wish to get at once into the author's spirit and method, he might turn to the articles on "Personality," "Goodness," "Love," "Holiness," "Creator," "Saviour," "Trinity."

In his treatment of these topics, and in fact all the topics, Dr. Clarke shows how far Christian thought has moved away from positions which have been considered orthodox through the centuries and towards the doctrines of the New Church. There is no vestige of the legalistic doctrine of atonement left. The doctrine of salvation is presented in language which the New-Churchman might well use for his own purpose. The whole doctrine of God and of His relations to men and the world is conceived and expressed in a thoroughly admirable manner. With a larger conception of the nature of love and a deeper insight into its metaphysical significance, the doctrine of God here unfolded would be very close to the New-Church idea.

But after all we must say, and we say it with profound regret, that the doctrine is not Christian in the strict sense of the word for the simple and obvious reason that it virtually denies the unique Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ as the sole object of Christian worship. No doctrine which fails to make Christ's Divinity central can in any proper sense be considered Christian. Glad as we are to recognize the skill with which Dr. Clarke has sifted the elements of traditional Christianity and moulded the worthy elements into a whole, we insist that it is false to the tradition itself to ignore the simple fact that Christ the Lord has been worshipped as God by hosts of Christians all down through the ages. Theology must take account of this fact and certainly Christian doctrine must undertake to justify it. Christ's proper and sole Divinity cannot be expressed in terms of the Revealer, the Interpreter, or the Medium of God's life. He must be recognized as the prime Source of life, and this Dr. Clarke does not do. We must, therefore, in this strict sense pronounce his book, as an attempt to present the Christian doctrine of God, a failure. It is fully true neither to the Christian Scriptures nor to Christian tradition.

RECENT CHRISTIAN PROGRESS.*

THE Centenary of the Swedenborg Society of London, to be held in that city next July, recalls a similar occasion celebrated at Hartford, Conn., last July. This was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of Hartford Theological Seminary and was marked by a series of monographs, bearing the above title, prepared by such of the professors, ex-professors, fellows, alumni, and trustees as had been already distinguished for work done in the several departments of the subject which were selected for treatment. The result is a most valuable and unique collection of expert studies in all the interests of modern religious thought. If the London meeting results in work of anything like the care and exhaustiveness of this admirable volume it will not only prove its value, but will add a capstone to the great structure of modern Christian thought.

In the Hartford work the whole vast field is divided into no less than sixty-five topics, very carefully selected and correlated, and arranged under ten main divisions. These succeed in bringing under one view the enormous mass of work done upon these subjects by men whose names are the most renowned in the whole field of modern thought as well as by a host of less known contributors.

The first five general sections deal more specifically with the religious thought of the period; the last five rather with what we may call, for the sake of distinction, the religious work of modern Christendom, especially with that of the so-called Evangelical bodies. Of these last sections, number six, *The Modern Churches*, is almost wholly organizational, under nine sub-headings, closing with a sane and hopeful view of the Federation and Union of Churches by Dr. Nash, of the Berkeley Seminary, California. The seventh, under the main heading, *Church Work*, includes amongst its twelve subtitles, excellent monographs on Theological Education, Church Administration, and Evangelism, Worship, Hymnody and Music, and The Sunday-School. The eighth section, under the general title of *Allied Agencies*, includes within its thirteen admirably arranged

**Recent Christian Progress: Studies in Christian Thought and Work during the last Seventy-Five Years.* By Professors and Alumni of Hartford Theological Seminary, in celebration of its seventy-fifth anniversary, May 24-26, 1909; edited by Lewis Bayles Paton. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1909. 605 pp. 8vo. cloth, \$3.00 net.

studies, records of the Christian Associations, Education in Schools and Colleges, and Work for the Poor, for Temperance, in the Social Evil, and in Child Saving. The last two sections, on Home and Foreign Missions, include intelligent studies of the various efforts in these directions for the Freedmen, amongst Immigrants, and the very interesting subjects of Work amongst the Turks under their new régime, and in Japan.

It is the first half of the book which is of the greatest general and scholarly interest. The first section, entitled Preliminary Studies, covers three excellent chapters. The first, by the Hartford Professor of Semitic, Rev. D. B. Macdonald, traces the progress in recent study especially of Hebrew, records the early struggles of the Renaissance students of the language, and shows the great indebtedness of all recent study to the work of Gesenius, dating from the beginning of the nineteenth century. Next follow fascinating records respectively of Oriental Archæology and Biblical Geography, covering the work of excavation and decipherment of inscriptions. It shows how greatly all modern students are indebted to pioneers like Rich, Chesney, Rawlinson, Smith, Kiepert and others. Great credit is also given to the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund, whose American Secretary, it will be remembered, was our late lamented Dr. Wright.

Especially noteworthy in the second section, of six monographs, on the Old Testament, are the two on its Higher Criticism and on Oriental and Old Testament History. Criticism is traced from its inception, with which Spinoza was not a little concerned, through its early development under Wolf and others. Both are matters of great interest to New-Churchmen when it is remembered that Swedenborg was plunged into the effects of Spinoza's work at the very beginning of his university career, and that Wolf was the philosopher whose influence was most potent throughout all the work of Swedenborg's middle life. The special development of the higher criticism of the Old Testament in recent times is traced with equal clearness and interest through the work of Astruc, Eichorn, and Geddes, and their disentanglement of the different threads of the Pentateuch; through Bleek, who originated the term Hexateuch, to identify Joshua with the earlier books; up to the modern works of Wellhausen, Robertson Smith and others. In all of this work the New-Churchman has especial interest, too long neglected. The re-ar-

rangement of the letter of Scripture under eras, authors or sources, and truer chronology, brings into greater prominence the arrangement we now find necessitated, under the inspiration of Providence, for the consecutiveness of the spiritual meaning; and the more we know of the times and circumstances under which the letter was produced, the more solid is our basis for carrying into detail the principles of spiritual interpretation so often suggested merely in outline by Swedenborg. The following chapter, on Oriental and Old Testament History, has similar enlightenment for the spiritual student, in addition to the actual interest of the story of exploration on which the recent results are based, which is so vividly and succinctly traced by the writer of this monograph. Other interesting chapters of this section deal with the Scientific Study of Old Testament Theology — the question of what theology the Old Testament teaches in itself, without regard to the dogmatic theology which this may confirm or controvert — again a most interesting application of the principle of the development of Divine Revelation, well recognized by Swedenborg. An enlightening account of the Study of the Apocrypha closes this section.

The development of the Study of the New Testament in Recent Times occupies the seven divisions of the third main section of the work. In every case the study is brought up from its roots in the past. In the chapter on New Testament Philology an interesting relic of the past is noticed, — how, previous to the nineteenth century, the language of the New Testament was regarded as a specially pure form of Greek devised by the Holy Spirit so as to convey the inspiration best. Here again the recent advance in the knowledge of the New Testament and other colloquial forms of Greek is a valuable basis, impossible to be overlooked by the faithful and exact interpreter of the spirit. The chapter on the Criticism of the New Testament Text includes the romance of the finding of the latest manuscript by Tischendorf in the waste-basket of the monks of St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai. The chapter on the Higher Criticism of the New Testament similarly traces the progress of the study through its more radical stages as to dates and authorship of the various books, down to the more recent conservative basis, which leaves the authorship much as stated in the titles of the books themselves, and leaves the dates of the Gospels all within the first century of our era. The chapter on New Testament Theology, again his-

torical and critical from internal evidence as opposed to that derived, even as late as Reformation times, from dogmatic pre-conceptions, is also of great interest in the study of the development of Divine Revelation. In a similarly informing chapter on New Testament Exegesis there is an admirable diatribe against allegorical interpretation, very satisfactory to the student of Swedenborg who recognizes, contrary to the superficial judgment of many, that Swedenborg's system of interpretation is not allegorical, but psychological and in accordance with universal rather than with the arbitrarily devised laws of the allegorists. Admirable sections on Church History Study in recent times, and on that of Systematic Theology, respectively in five and thirteen monographs, complete the work. In both the progress is shown to be great, and providentially directed towards more clarity and sobriety of judgment.

The work as a whole is epochal. It should be in the hands of every minister and student who makes any claim to being abreast of his generation. For its own information it is invaluable, and as a carefully culled bibliography of the exhaustive series of studies it embraces it is unique. It should be on the historical shelves of every theological school library, and has already been incorporated as part of the course in Church History of our own Convention Theological School, in Cambridge.

CHARLES W. HARVEY.

RELIGION AND MIRACLE.*

BEFORE the storm awakened in the religious world by Dr. Eliot's address on the "Religion of the Future" had spent itself, this book became the subject of widespread interest and debate, especially in New England. If it had come from a Unitarian it need occasion no surprise; but coming as it does from an orthodox preacher and scholar of renown, and one who took pains not long ago, to declare himself a conservative trinitarian, the extreme positions reached have proved startling and have called out much adverse criticism.

At the beginning Dr. Gordon explains that this study of miracles has come from no personal interest in the subject. For many years

* *Religion and Miracle.* By GEORGE A. GORDON, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company. 1909. 255 pp. Crown 8vo. Cloth, \$1.30 net.

moving toward the heart of Christian faith, miracles have ceased more and more to be significant to him. He has become absorbed in considerations of the Eternal Spirit and the relations of human souls to the Father in heaven. He writes: —

I had for many years dwelt in a sphere far removed from outward signs and wonders; I had, therefore, quietly ceased to regard the tradition of signs and wonders that accompanied the Lord. One day, however, I fell into conversation with a company of young ministers; I found them greatly troubled. They felt that as honest men they could not say that they believed in miracles; and that incapacity created suspicion as to how much of the gospel remains when the miracles are set aside. (p. ix.)

The purpose of the book is to meet this difficulty, and the writer's conclusion is that the Christian faith need suffer no loss if all the miracles of the Bible are shown to be myths, the folk-lore of the superstitious age in which the Scriptures were written.

The study is made by the methods of the higher criticism. The considerations are presented in the light of history and natural science, but in the simple, beautiful style of which the author is a master. He calls attention to the fact that the idea of a fixed order of nature has been gradually taking possession of human thought until now it is dominant. "There are no effects without causes." "In the realm of nature this order is constant and inviolable." We read: —

A miraculous universe, in the sense of a universe uncontrolled by law, would be, for a reasonable man aiming at true vision and right behavior, the supreme calamity. He would be at a loss to know what to think or what to do; indeed, in such a universe there could be neither truth nor right. (p. 50.)

From this the conclusion is reached that a God of a fixed order is a more substantial foundation of faith than a God of miracles. And yet he contends that the idea of a fixed order of nature is an assumption that cannot be absolutely verified; still it has received only verification, and no contradiction, so far as contemporary science has gone. "So far it is as sure as anything human well can be" (p. 19). Therefore, no man knows enough to logically deny that a miracle ever has or ever will occur (p. 29). Still the whole field of experience in modern science is against miracles. They are logical possibilities but natural improbabilities. A rational faith must be based upon what is verifiable and surely true. Therefore the Christian faith must be able to stand without the miracles of the

Bible. Dr. Gordon then endeavors to prove that it can so stand, holding that it has no need of the miraculous to-day, at least in the plane of nature. There are intimations of belief in the necessity of inward miracles of the spirit, by which faith in the presence of the living God is given. But in them no connection with outward miracles is perceived. (p. 56.)

But Dr. Gordon does not admit that this is his personal belief. He expressly says: —

That I may see for myself, that I may help others to see, that religion is independent of miracle, I accept in a provisional way the denial of miracle as the basis of debate. Miracle is myth; so it is said by a multitude of scholars and thinkers; and we allow this contention to stand. These thinkers assert that natural law rules over all; and we accept the assertion as true. On this ground it has been shown that mechanism is the vehicle of Spirit; the world as natural law carries with it the eternal God. (p. 168.)

I am still further free to confess that miracle is no part of my working philosophy of life, not because I deny its reality, but because I cannot be sure of its reality, and I wish to live as far as possible among the things that are sure. (p. 167.)

The defect in Dr. Gordon's defence of the Christian faith, as many of his own orthodox brethren have pointed out, is in accepting the premise that a miracle is contrary to the fixed order of nature. The more approved premise is that a miracle is a revelation within nature of a higher law. Swedenborg goes farther and explains this when he teaches that: —

All things which are viewed in nature . . . take place from the influx of the spiritual world into the natural; and in themselves are marvels, which on account of their accustomed aspect and perennial recurrence, are not accounted miracles. But know that the miracles related in the Word were done in like manner by means of influx from that prior world into this posterior one; and that they were done by bringing in such things as are in the spiritual world into corresponding things in the natural world. (*De Miraculis*, n. 60.)

Thus Swedenborg, a man of natural science who thoroughly appreciated the importance of a fixed order and a Creator of unchanging laws, shows how the miracles of the Bible were performed strictly in accordance with this fixed order operating through the spiritual world into the natural. Nothing ever occurs in the natural world without this influx of life and power from the spiritual world, which Swedenborg describes as the world of causes. So when God revealed Himself to men how could miracles fail to appear as signs

of His presence and power? We cannot see that Dr. Gordon is right in holding that the miracles can be separated from that record without taking the revelation of God out of it. The history of Israel would not be different from any common history written by men if the miraculous were eliminated. And the Lord Jesus would not differ from others if the miraculous were to be taken away. For then He could not be the Son of God. The Divine origin of Jesus Christ by birth from a virgin is the miracle of miracles, and upon its historical verity rests the Christian faith.

Here Dr. Gordon meets the test of his whole defence of the Christian religion, and fails by falling into the most grievous inconsistency. For he gives up the virgin birth and grants that Joseph was the father of Jesus. And then, in exalting Jesus above the other sons of Joseph as the wonderful Messiah, he ignores the fixed order of heredity, unconsciously requiring just the kind of miracle that is impossible; for without a miracle operating contrary to the law of heredity, how could Jesus be so entirely different from the other sons of the same father and mother? How, without such an impossible miracle, could he become the Son of God? Dr. Gordon's attempt to answer these questions follows:—

The theory that Jesus had no human father cannot make him more Divine; the denial of that theory cannot in any way interfere with his supremacy. Whichever way he began to be, Jesus is what He is. He is independent of the question how He came into the world. (p. 96.)

But he is not content to leave the matter thus a mystery, but goes on to extol the sacredness of human marriage, dwells upon the nearness of God in the gift of every offspring, and concludes:—

Thus it is that children in worthy human homes are born of the Spirit. By the strength of the Holy Ghost they began to be; by his strength they were brought into the world. In this sense it is forever true that Jesus was conceived of the Holy Ghost while born of his mother and her honorable husband. (p. 102.)

Dr. Gordon holds that the influence of the father upon the child is slight compared with that of the mother. Thence he concludes that if the Creative Spirit could neutralize the malign influence of the mother, that of the father could be taken care of in the same manner. But to do either would call for a miracle contrary to the fixed order of nature, the law of inheritance. If Joseph was the

father, two such miracles would be required instead of one, according to the gospel record.

But Swedenborg accepts the gospel record and explains it by a miracle which is in accordance with the fixed order. First of all he shows that the soul of every offspring is from the father, and that the mother's part is to clothe that soul in an earthly body and nature. Hence the external characteristics of the child resemble the mother; but the internal and persistent characteristics resemble the father. Taking the account of the birth of the Lord as it is given in Divine Revelation, the soul, being from Jehovah, is Divine. Then we have a Divine incarnation indeed; the Divine is clothed in a human body and nature, a God-Man is given, who can be tempted through the maternal inheritance like as we are; but from the paternal it is without sin. So the hells of human iniquity can be met and conquered by a Divine Redeemer. Always doing what is pleasing to the Father, the indwelling Divine soul, put off what is from the mother and put in the place of it a glorified Divine-Human from the Father. So the tabernacle of God is forevermore with men, to save them when they call upon Him incarnate, and made known.

Thus Swedenborg teaches that it was by Divine conception alone that God could become incarnate and redeem and save the world in accordance with His own fixed order.

H. C. H.

THE SOCIAL QUESTION.*

THE social question is upon us. Its importance for the future welfare of the race cannot be over estimated. Its roots lie in the moral and spiritual aspirations of mankind. Its branches spread into all the avenues of human life.

The social question involves the fate of the family, the state, and

* *Jesus Christ and the Social Question.* An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in Relation to Some of the Problems of Modern Social Life. By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1908. 374 pp. 12mo. Cloth \$1.50 net.

The Approach to the Social Question. An Introduction to the Study of Social Ethics. By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1909. 210 pp. 12mo. Cloth \$1.25 net.

the Church. It involves the order and organization of industry and the principles and methods of business the world over. It involves the fate of the political, moral, and spiritual ideals which have been laboriously, patiently, and painfully constructed throughout the ages. In short the social question means impending revolution on the largest scale the world has ever witnessed.

Professor Peabody gives us a well-written exposition of the present status of this question. His historical summaries are valuable. His sketches of actual conditions are illuminating. His discussion and interpretations are sober, well considered, and suggestive.

In "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," he undertakes to present what might be called the Christian point of view, and the Christian way of dealing with all questions of human life, and in particular with social questions. Socialism is taken as the typical expression of the social interest and effort of the present age. Its radicalism, its ethical passion, its anti-Christian animus, its revolutionary temper, are well brought out. The socialists are prone to regard the Christian Church as merely one of the various institutions and instruments of capitalism, and therefore destined to extinction. In this view also religion is to be altogether abolished and the socialistic program substituted for it. In other words, in so far as religion is a philosophy of life, socialism is to be the religion of the future. From another point of view it is asked, can the Christian religion, or more specifically the teachings of Christ, be brought to bear upon modern conditions? Christian communism, the works of Christian philanthropy, Christian opportunism, and Christian socialism, are cited as attempts to find a place for the Christian life in the modern world. These efforts represent variously the conviction that the Christian religion must work as a social force in the organization of economic and industrial life, that the alienation between Christianity and social effort is unnecessary and unnatural. In view of this demand that Christianity shall be socially effective, it is interesting to note the common reverence for the person of Christ, and this leads to the hope that a satisfactory solution is to be found in the direct personal teachings of Christ on social questions. A careful reading of the Gospels shows three characteristics of this teaching: (1) the point of view is interior, that is, the quality of the inner life of the individual is central; (2) the view is from above and in the light of a long perspective; (3) the objective goal is the kingdom of heaven. With these as

guiding principles quotations from the Gospels are given and interpreted. There is some recognition of a spiritual meaning, but it is flickering. Herein lies the most significant defect of the book. The range of the social question is indicated by showing that in succession (1) the family, (2) the social environment, (3) and in particular the industrial order are involved. The diversity of social conditions gives rise to the problem of the rich and the poor, to each of which a chapter is devoted. The final chapter on the "Correlation of the Social Questions" shows how extensive, intricate, and interdependent these questions are.

In "The Approach to the Social Question," the discussion is carried in a formal manner somewhat further. The correlation of the social questions leads to a search for the unifying principle. This is identified and designated as social force or energy in correspondence with the unified conception of physical force or energy. The philosophy of the social question brings to view certain aspects or modes of approach. Social science collects the facts and generalizes preparatory to the systematic treatment which sociology aims at. There has been a general disposition to identify the social question with economics, but inasmuch as ethical and religious ideals are involved, we must view the question as essentially and internally an ethical one, while externally it is economic. These aspects are developed at length and altogether the chapters here concerned give a good summary of the general situation. The tone of the book is wholesome and conservative though there is sympathetic treatment of radical views and efforts.

L. F. H.

SIXTY YEARS WITH THE BIBLE.*

THIS is a unique autobiography. Dr. Clarke writes the history of his own life in dealing with that which has been most vital to him and about which, not only his religious experience as a man, but also his life-work as a minister of the Gospel and a professor in two theological schools, has centered. Knowing his experience decade by decade for sixty years with the Word of God there is little left for us

**Sixty Years with the Bible. A Record of Experience.* By WILLIAM NEWTON CLARKE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1909. 259 pp. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.25 net.

to learn of his ministry and his character. But he did not intend this. He simply meant to show from his own experience the history of the change that has taken place in the orthodox Christian Church in regard to the Bible. He has succeeded admirably, and has given to what otherwise might be a dry subject all the fascination and charm that comes from being taken into the confidence of a great, honest, manly soul in this deepest of all experiences.

We first find him in the home of his father, a Baptist minister who loved and trusted the Bible with simple-hearted faith and understood it largely as his church had taught him its meaning, but not slavishly. The reverence for the Divine Word in the family worship and life of this household made a lasting impression which carried Dr. Clarke safely through the great crisis in the Bible faith of the last century. Like all orthodox Christians in the middle of that century this household held the Bible to be literally true in every jot and tittle. Not until he was fifteen years of age did our author learn that anyone ever thought of questioning it. Then by an older boy in Sunday-school his attention was called to some contradictions in the letter, from which he tried to turn away, for they would mean that God had contradicted Himself, which was incredible. But when he began to study geology he found himself compelled to let science interpret the Bible. It raised a problem that involved all the methods of the higher criticism, which in after years he was led slowly to adopt; but always reverently and cautiously. In the theological school as a student he became thoroughly familiar with the Scriptures in the original tongues, and later he "knew out of what stratum of thought or group of conceptions in the New Testament any given conception came — a knowledge far more valuable than that of verse and chapter." He tried to get back into the times and situations in which the various parts of the books were written in order to learn the exact and true meaning of the writer.

There were many valuable results from this habit of thoroughness in critical study; for he saw that we are prone to put into the Scriptures our own notions instead of getting the writers' meaning out of them; and he learned that texts must be viewed in the light of their contexts, that, indeed, not the texts but the principles of the Bible as a whole must be considered in interpreting their meaning; he learned that the Bible in the letter is not an infallible book, or collection of writings; and that the various writings are not all equally valuable

for purposes of Divine revelation; thus, he became convinced that no doctrine of inspiration with which he was acquainted could stand the test of his studies; he reached the conclusion that "if the Bible is to be recognized as absolutely authoritative, we must have a canon that is settled by Divine authority. The God who requires our submission to certain books of His own inspiring must not leave us to find out for ourselves which books they are." (p. 238.)

Let us pause here to call attention to the fact that this is a perfectly reasonable conclusion, and that it is just what the New Church has in the knowledge of correspondences between the natural world and the spiritual, according to which the Word is so written that there is a continuous spiritual meaning running steadily within the letter of the books that are Divinely inspired, which proves them to be the Divine Word. This is what Dr. Clarke needs to know, for it will restore his confidence in the Bible as an infallible book; and then he will have what he also demands, an infallible, because Divine, interpreter. Lacking this he is driven to the position that it is only a collection of writings gathered up by the Church as "the precious memorials of her faith" (p. 239). Nevertheless, he holds that "by this natural process we have received the greatest book of spiritual reality and power that the world has ever known"; and that there is no need of any change in it to meet the changing conditions of life in the world. All that is needed is to understand it at its real value and put it to its use (p. 240). Its use is to lead men to God. He says he has often "counselled students to transfer to God Himself the faith that they were building on the Bible" (p. 216). By this he meant that they should cease to regard the Book as an *object* of study and make it a *means* of study (p. 245). For regardless of how it was written, and of the fallibility of its letter, it is a revelation of God and life, of the Divine principles of religion (p. 247). This he finds to be the real value of the Bible, its religious value; and while he sees great use in the work of the higher criticism, and looks forward to the solution of many problems that it has raised, he has no fear that it will ever weaken the religious value of the Scriptures. This is not an open question and never can be. "It is a gift of God that will abide." To set it forth is the purpose of these reminiscences, and to invite timid souls out of bondage to the old traditions into the liberty of honest and scholarly investigation, in which he himself receives inspiration (p. 255).

Dr. Clarke's reverence is always deep and tender but his great difficulty, as already noted, is in not being able to see that the infallibility of the Bible lies in its spiritual meaning, residing within the letter. Hence he is compelled to place his own intellect above it as a final authority. Divine Revelation requires a book that in some sense is infallible.

H. C. H.

NEW ISSUES IN THE "LIBRARY EDITION" OF THE WORKS OF SWEDENBORG.*

WE can at present but acknowledge the receipt of these attractive volumes, the appearance of which points to the completion of the "Library Edition" as close at hand, leaving some editorial comments which we have in mind, upon the value of these differing translations to the English reader of Swedenborg, until this completion is actually realized. In the meantime, we hope to receive from Mr. Potts a brief statement of the scholarly grounds upon which he would retain the word "Conjugal" — a word which has come to have a place in the English language through the sponsorship of the New Church.

W. H. M.

* *Arcana Cœlestia*, Library Edition, Volume XI. Thoroughly revised and edited by the REV. JOHN FAULKNER POTTS, B. A. 754 pp. \$1.25.

Conjugal Love. Library Edition. Translated by SAMUEL M. WARREN. Translation revised by Louis H. Tafel. 612 pp. \$1.25.

STANDARD NEW-CHURCH BOOKS.

The Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg. With Portrait. Benjamin Worcester	\$2.00
Swedenborg and the New Church. James Reed	50 cents
Lectures on the New Dispensation. Benjamin F. Barrett	60 cents
The Divine Word Opened. Jonathan Bayley	1.00
Emanuel Swedenborg; his Life, Teachings, and Influence. George Trobridge. Paper	25 cents
Discrete Degrees in Successive and Simultaneous Order. Nathan C. Burnham. Illustrated by Diagrams.	4.00
Dictionary of Correspondences	1.25
General Index to Swedenborg's Scripture Quotations. Arthur Hodson Searle	3.00
The Nature of Spirit and of Man as a Spiritual Being. Chauncey Giles	50 cents
Foundation Truths of the Christian Religion; passages selected from Swedenborg	50 cents
The Science of Correspondences Elucidated. Edward Made- ley	1.50
Swedenborg's Doctrine of Correspondence. Lewis P. Mercer	75 cents
An Appeal in Behalf of the Views Held by the New Church. Samuel Noble	75 cents
Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg. Theophilus Parsons	50 cents
The Professor's Letters; with Portrait of the Author. Theoph- ilus Parsons	60 cents
Paper boards	30 cents
The Holy Word in its own Defence. Abiel Silver	75 cents
The Swedenborg Concordance. 6 vols. Cloth	24.00
Swedenborg and the Doctrines of the New Church. Ru- dolph L. Tafel	1.75
Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg; orig- inal and translated. Rev. James Hyde	10.00
Compendium of the Theological Writings of Swedenborg. Samuel M. Warren	1.50
Correspondences of the Bible: Animals. John Worcester	1.00
“ “ “ Plants, etc. “ “	1.00
Physiological Correspondences. John Worcester	1.00
Spiritual Interpretation of the Scriptures. John Worcester Genesis and Exodus.	75 cents
Matthew's Gospel.	50 cents

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

No. 16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON

Works of Emanuel Swedenborg.

ROTCH EDITION. 12MO. NEW PRICES.

The Heavenly Arcana disclosed which are in the Sacred Scripture or Word of the Lord. Vols. I. to XIX., text; Vol. XX., index. Each	\$1.00
Heaven and Its Wonders, and Hell	\$1.00
The White Horse. Paper	15 cents
The New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine as learned from Heaven	75 cents
The Earths in our Solar System, which are called Planets, and the Earths in the Starry Heavens; their Inhabitants, and Spirits and Angels thence. Paper	30 cents
The Final Judgment and the Destruction of Babylon; also Continuation concerning the Final Judgment and concerning the Spiritual World. Paper	35 cents
The Intercourse between the Soul and the Body. Paper	15 cents
Four Doctrines of the New Jerusalem. Concerning the Lord; the Sacred Scripture; a Life According to the Precepts of the Decalogue; and Faith	\$1.00
Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom: also the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body	\$1.00
Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Providence	\$1.00
The Apocalypse Revealed. 2 Vols.	\$2.00
Marriage Love	\$1.00
A Summary Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church. Paper	25 cents
The True Christian Religion. 3 Vols.	\$2.50
Miscellaneous Theological Works [consisting of The Final Judgment, The White Horse, The Earths in Our Solar System, and the Summary Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church]	\$1.00

The Rotch Edition is now complete as regards the theological writings published by Swedenborg himself.

Our Catalog, listing other editions of Swedenborg's writings as well as works by collateral writers, will be sent on application.

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON